THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXVII.—APRIL, 1912—No. 146.

A WORD ON TROUBLED PARAGUAY.

RUMORS of war are once more floating to us from the Southern Hemisphere, at a time when we had begun to hope that revolution was a thing of the past in South America. South America has reached a period of increasing prosperity, and the eyes of the world are turned upon her as upon a storehouse wherein nature has deposited her choicest treasures. It is indeed a pity that just at this time of awakening interest several of those favored countries should again be given up to internecine strife.

In the past South America has known by the bitterest of experiences what revolution is; she has drunk the cup of blood to its dregs. Not one of her republics has escaped the baneful influences of civil war.

Until late in the nineteenth century there was one exception, and that exception was Paraguay, the garden spot of South America, a country which, I am sure, is still destined for great things. We therefore cannot but feel regret when, together with rumors of fighting in Brazil and in Ecuador, we read that Paraguay is now in the throes of something like a revolution.

Paraguay is the earliest seat of civilization in the regions of the La Plata. Discovered by Sebastian Cabot in 1525, though Solis had sailed up the La Plata as early as 1516, Paraguay was conquered in 1536 by Juan de Ayolas, who in the same year founded Asuncion many years before the foundations of the city of Buenos Aires were laid. Asuncion became the headquarters of the Spanish Gov-

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1912 by J. P. Turner, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

ernment east of the Cordilleras, extending its dominion over all the La Plata country, including the western district of Tucuman to the slopes of the Andes.

Toward the close of the sixteenth century Fernando Arias, the Governor, who was a native of the country, introduced the Jesuits. Gradually these good fathers converted and civilized the Indians, gathering them into communities. The Paraguay Reductions became famous in history. The rule of the Jesuits was paternal, it is true, and their government more or less absolute, or theocratic, if you like, but the Indians were benefited. Agriculture flourished, great works were undertaken, and even the fine arts were cultivated. Everything seemed peaceable and happy until the Paulistas from Brazil swooped down upon the missions and almost ruined them. Immense numbers of the unfortunate neophytes were carried off to Brazil as slaves. This was in the seventeenth century. However, the Jesuits, nothing daunted, moved down the Paraná with the remnants of their flock and established a new Christian republic, with a number of agricultural and industrial settlements. Each colony was established on a uniform plan, with a plaza in the centre, where the church, college, arsenal and workshop stood. Regularity prevailed and religious services were performed daily. In 1740 the total population of the Jesuit Reductions was estimated at more than 140,000 souls.

Then came the final blow, the machinations of the enemies of the society prevailed and the Jesuits were mercilessly driven out of the Portuguese and Spanish possessions, as they were expelled from the mother countries. The missions went to pieces, and in 1801 only 43,639 survivors could be found who had lived under the paternal rule of the Fathers of the Society of Jesus.

The name of the society is to-day written all over South America. It is impossible to travel over Northern Argentina and Paraguay without finding memories of the Jesuits at every step. From the great basin of the Amazon north, from the town of Auchiela, in Northern Brazil, to the Cathedral of Bahia, with its memorial tablet to Father Antonio Vieira, down to the Province of Mendoza and the Territory of Neuquen, in Argentina, everywhere you meet with the Jesuits. Paraguay and the Territory of Misiones, in the Argentine Republic, are actually covered with the ruins of the Jesuit missions, and wherever you go in Corrientes, in Tucuman, in Buenos Aires, you find the Jesuits again and again.

The enemies of the society have pointed to the fact that the Jesuit labors were so soon dissolved as a proof of their lack of solidity, and at the International Congress of Americanists at Buenos Aires an acrimonious discussion on this subject was pre-

cipitated by a modern explorer in Paraguay. We must, however, not forget that it is with man, as it is with the tropical soil. Leave a plantation in the tropics six months without cultivation and it grows up into a wilderness. Take away priests and spiritual advisers from a parish for ten years and see what will happen. No! the return to savagery of the Paraguay Indians must not be imputed to the Jesuits. If blame is to be attached to any one, then turn over the pages of history to find the names of Pombal and Arana.

Shortly after the expulsion of the Jesuits the La Plata countries were separated from the jurisdiction of the Viceroy of Peru and constituted into a separate viceroyalty, with Buenos Aires as the head. At the period of the revolution that swept over Spanish America in the beginning of the nineteenth century Paraguay obtained its independence, in spite of the efforts of Buenos Aires to annex it. In the course of its history as a republic Paraguay has been, to a great extent and for many long years under despotic government, ruled by the mighty hand of a dictator.

First there was Francia, whose policy was one of isolation and who kept foreigners out of the country. Of course, under such conditions there was no question of progress. Francia's absolute rule ended with his death in 1840. He was followed by Carlos Antonio Lopez, another dictator, under whom the country enjoyed a Constitution, at least in name. Lopez, it must be said to his credit, did much for the welfare of the country. In 1859 he began the Central Railway, that now extends from Asuncion to the borders of Argentina, thus far the only railway in the republic.

In 1862 Carlos A. Lopez was succeeded by his son, the famous Francisco Solano Lopez, who also labored to some extent for the material welfare of the country, though he ruled it with absolute power. Still, up to his time Paraguay had been in peace, and it had been spared the horrors of bloodshed through which the other republics had passed.

But its day came when Lopez, alienating his friends across the line, precipitated a frightful war by attacking Argentina. Now began the most bloody war ever waged in South America. Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina combined against the little republic, and a death struggle ensued. The quiet, simple, pleasure-loving, holiday-making, flowery Paraguayans gave to the world the example of a people struggling for their existence with undaunted heroism. The Paraguayans were fighters, indeed. Lopez himself fell dead upon the field of battle rather than surrender to the enemy. The war ended with his death in 1870.

Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina had agreed in 1865 to respect the sovereignty of Paraguay for five years, and after the war its in-

dependence continued, preserved by the balance of power which is still its safeguard.

Unfortunately, the country was ruined and the male population killed off. Even to-day there is an immense preponderance of the female element.

The area of the republic is 171,815 square miles, but the population is only 4.6 to the square mile, or 800,000. The climate, sub-tropical, is delightful, with an undulating country, watered by large streams. There are in Paraguay as many inducements to immigrants as in almost any South American country, and yet immigration has been a negligible quantity, although there are several small colonies of foreigners. This beautiful land of flowers and of oranges possesses immense agricultural resources, while there are great opportunities for pastoral industries. The total foreign commerce is on the increase, and though at my latest information the imports still exceeded the exports, this may partly be explained by the great importation of rolling stock and material for the completion of the Central Railway.

Paraguay has few industries, though, as I have indicated, the possibilities of its resources are very great. All tropical products may be cultivated in Paraguay. Tobacco is one of the leading crops, but the cultivation of sugar, coffee, rice, mandioca, yerba maté (the Paraguayan tea) and cotton are promising. Cotton raising possesses immense possibilities, with a large yield per acre and the good reputation that the Paraguayan cotton possesses.

One of the most important industries is the preparation of the oil of petit grain, an extract from the leaves of a native orange tree, used as a basis for perfumes and flavoring extracts.

Another industry is lace making. Paraguayan lace stands eminent to-day, not only for the delicate quality of the work, but also for the variety and beauty of the patterns.

The cattle industry is increasing, and in recent years many cattlemen from Argentina and Brazil have settled in Paraguay. It is estimated that there are over 5,000,000 cattle of all kinds in the republic.

The capital of Paraguay is Asuncion, on the east bank of the Paraguay River, at a distance of 970 miles from Buenos Aires. Its population is 80,000. A great portion of the city has been completely modernized, with wide and well-paved streets, illuminated by electricity.

Asuncion is regarded as one of the most picturesque cities of the New World. From the eminence where it is seated the vision extends over the river and beyond to the immense forest regions of the Chaco. Three beautiful avenues, Colon, España and Asun-

cion, bordered by villas, add their charm to the eye. Three lines of tramways unite the centre of the city with the outlying districts and the suburbs, while a steam tramway runs to San Lorenzo, with its fashionable country residences. Is it not a pity that blood should now be flowing in these streets?

Asuncion has good hotels, fine shops and stores, several banking establishments and fine public buildings. Prominent among these are the Goverment palace, the Cathedral, the theatre and the railway station. The massive Government building was formerly the palace of the dictator Lopez.

The early morning hours in Asuncion are of especial interest, for business begins early. The market is teeming with activity and the Guarani women, smoking their cigars and exhibiting their wares, add a touch of the picturesque to the scene. From 11 to 2 business is suspended under the burning rays of the sun, but in the afternoon life begins again, and the women and girls are once more in evidence.

The national archives of Paraguay are among the most important of South America, and they will be invaluable to the historian of the future, in spite of the losses they have suffered. They have been rearranged, in 6,241 volumes, with documents of all kinds, 525 being historical and some going back to 1534. The "Biblioteca Americana," founded by Senor Godoi, is one of the finest collections of Americana, with 15,000 volumes. The collection of old American newspapers is perhaps the most remarkable of its kind.

The Museum of the Fine Arts in Asuncion possesses some excellent paintings that would figure anywhere with honor, and an academy of design, painting and sculpture offers a permanent exposition of national art to the public. Connected with the Museum of the Fine Arts is the Historical Museum, with a fine collection of arms, banners and portraits.

I have merely given a glimpse of the beautiful city on the Paraguay, but enough to cause regret for anything like strife that might retard its progress.

Asuncion is the see of a Bishop, suffragan to the Archbishop of Buenos Aires. This diocese is the oldest in the La Plata countries, having been founded by Pope Paul III. in 1547.

One of the finest temples in the republic is the one known as the "Oratorio of the Virgin of Asuncion." It was begun some years ago, and recently the Department of Public Works has called for bids to complete it. This church is noted for the beauty of its architecture.

As in other countries of South America, Church and State are united in Paraguay, for according to the Constitution the Roman

Catholic religion is that of the country, though Congress may not prohibit the exercise of other forms of worship.

Besides Asuncion, there are a number of smaller towns and settlements scattered throughout the republic, especially in the western portion of the country, toward the Paraguay, many of them dating from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The second city of the republic is Villa Rica, with a population exceeding 28,000. It is connected by the Central Railway with Asuncion. The town dates from 1566. Situated on an eminence, it is most picturesque and healthy; in fact, a health resort. Numerous invalids from Montevideo, Buenos Aires and other places on the Rio de la Plata flock to it in quest of pure air. It is also of considerable commercial importance.

The old Jesuit church and college that existed well into the nineteenth century were destroyed by the Dictator Francia.

Quite a number of towns are located on the Paraguay, being thus accessible by water. For instance, there is Humaita, that during the great war was the bulwark of Paraguay, bidding defiance to the invaders. Lopez had a chain across the river, but in June, 1868, a very high flood enabled the Brazilian warships to force a passage upward.

The next town, Villa del Pilar, formerly Neembucer, was the only place in Francia's time where foreign merchants were permitted to trade. Further up the Paraguay, beyond Asuncion, lies Concepcion, an old town founded in 1622. Having suffered greatly in the war, it had only 2,000 inhabitants in 1892. Since then its progress has been exceedingly rapid, and it is now the third city of the republic, with a population of about 16,000. Concepcion is the centre of a flourishing cattle trade and the headquarters of the commerce of the Upper Paraguay, as well as of the State of Matto Grosso, in Brazil.

Further north, the Aquidaban River empties into the Paraguay. It was on the banks of this stream that Lopez and his son, Pancho, fell fighting to the last. The Aquidaban is only one of many rivers that flow down from the highlands of the west to the Paraguay.

The great region of the Gran Chaco west of the river is inhabited by uncivilized Indian tribes. This territory is partly claimed by Paraguay and partly by Bolivia. The Paraguayan Chaco may contain some 30,000 or more Indians. As a rule, the Chaco Indians are unwarlike. Prominent among the tribes are the Lenguas, one of the most numerous and a peaceable and naturally industrious people. There is a Protestant mission among them. The needs of the South American Indians are very great spiritually. It is indeed sad to reflect that after all the early labors of the missionaries

there is still so much to be done; but alas! the harvest is immense, but the laborers are few. At the present time the Franciscans, the Capuchins, the Fathers of Don Bosco and others are prominent in the work of evangelizing the natives in the more southern portion of the South American continent or in Argentina and Chile. In South America, as in North America, the Indian is doomed to extinction as the white man advances step by step. Contact with civilization seems fatal to him.

Asuncion may be reached by water from Buenos Aires at least by three lines of steamers, steamers that are quite well equipped and elegantly fitted up. The first line is that of the Lloyd Brazileiro, a Brazilian company that run their ships to New York and the West Indies, up the Amazon and along the coast. The particular line going to Asuncion is that of the Upper Paraguay. It proceeds from Rosario, in Argentina, stopping at a number of Argentine ports before reaching Asuncion. The journey from Buenos Aires to Asuncion lasts about five days. From Asuncion steamers of this line continue up the Paraguay to Cuyabá, the capital of the State of Matto Grosso, in Brazil.

The second line is that of Mihanovich, leaving Buenos Aires for Asuncion about three times a week. Finally, the line of Amadeo F. Nunez connects Buenos Aires with Asuncion four times a month.

Until recently one might travel to Asuncion only part of the way by rail, but to-day you may proceed all the way by railroad and reach Asuncion in less than two days. The Paraguay Central Railroad has been extended to Villa Encarnacion, on the Upper Paraná, and the Argentine railway, the Argentine Northeastern, has reached Posadas, on the south bank, opposite Villa Encarnacion. A ferry plies across the river connecting the two roads, and thus Buenos Aires and Asuncion are now linked together by the way of iron.

A very important railway that is projected will run from Asuncion across the republic eastward into Brazil to the port of S. Francisco, and thus bring Asuncion in direct communication with the Atlantic. A portion of the Brazilian section of this road has already been completed.

In course of time this railway will be extended westward from Asuncion across the Paraguay and the territory of Gran Chaco, through Bolivia and Northern Chile to the Pacific coast. The Atlantic and Pacific are now united by four connecting lines between Buenos Aires and Valparaiso, namely, the Pacific line from Buenos Aires to Mendoza, the Argentine Transandean from Mendoza up the Andes to Las Cuevas, the Chilean Transandean from Las Cuevas through the tunnel and down the Andes to Santa Rosa de los Andes

and the Chilean Railway from Los Andes to Valparaiso. By means of the Trans-Paraguayan railway the coast of Brazil will be brought into direct railway communication with the Pacific coast of Chile. It goes without saying that such a railway will exercise an immense influence over Paraguay and open it to the world.

All that Paraguay now needs is a stable government and a good, healthy immigration. She has the resources that are awaiting exploitation through capital and labor, but without a stable and responsible government neither capital nor labor will avail much.

In her new Constitution, drawn up after the great war, Paraguay declared against dictatorship and seemed determined to be done with it forever, yet it would seem that the spirit of dictatorship is still in the air. What the present trouble amounts to it is hard to understand. Difficulty seems to have been brewing for a considerable time. Up to last July the Presidential chair was occupied by a provisional President in the person of Colonel Albino Gara. On the resignation of Gara on the 5th of the month the Congress appointed Senor Liberato M. Rojas to act as Provisional President until November 25, 1911. On September 30, however, the legislative body voted to prolong the term of Rojas as Provisional President until 1914; in other words, throughout the whole constitutional term. The present insurrection is against the government of Rojas, whose person has been captured by the revolutionaries. New developments are taking place every day.

Argentine and Brazil, as the great powers of South America, to some extent responsible for Paraguay, are interfering, it is said, and sending their gunboats up the river, as we send our warships to the scene of trouble, as we have them now on the yellow fever infected coast of Ecuador, where other troubles are in progress. It remains to be seen what influence Brazil and Argentina will exercise. The countries most interested in Paraguay, owing to their proximity to it, are Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina and Bolivia—Brazil and Argentina are, of course, the most important factors. They are commercial rivals, and one has not to be a great political economist to infer that they must needs be political rivals. Which of them will become the dominant factor in South American politics?

Brazil has the larger territory, the greater population and a greater variety of resources, with less of the foreign element than Argentina. But there is much Negro blood in Brazil, together with a torrid climate. Besides, it would seem from recent reports that Brazil has troubles of her own at home just now.

Argentina, on the other hand, has the commerce, the wealth, the energy, an efficient army and a splendid navy. Her population is largely of foreign extraction, but it is fervid with patriotism and

the children of foreigners are Argentinians to the backbone. Brazil and Argentina, in consequence of this rivalry, are not overmuch in love with each other, though there may be many professions of friendship and though an A, B, C Triple Alliance exist between Argentina, Brazil and Chile. But it is precisely by this rivalry that the independence of Uruguay and Paraguay is safeguarded. Neither of these countries need fear an attack from its powerful neighbors, one of whom would hesitate to attempt anything like annexation for fear of the other. Thus the balance of power is preserved.

A solution of the problem and a guarantee of peace in Paraguay would be a treaty between Brazil and Argentina, the powers most interested, leaving Uruguay and Bolivia out of the question, by which the independence of Paraguay would be guaranteed, with a possible intervention for the common good in cases like the present.

Paraguay, unlike Argentina and Brazil, that possess a federal form of government, is a centralized republic. The President and the Vice President are elected for a term of four years, the former drawing a salary of $7,000 per annum. The President's Cabinet consists of the Ministers of the Interior, Treasury, War, Foreign Relations and of Justice, Worship and Public Instruction.

The National Congress consists of the Senate and Chamber of Deputies, the members of which are elected by direct popular vote, all citizens over eighten years being entitled to the right of suffrage. Congress meets yearly from April 1 to August 31.

The standing army of Paraguay counts only 2,600 officers and men, but all citizens between the ages of twenty and thirty-five are liable to service in the National Guard. The republic has practically no navy, unless its dispatch boat and couple of transports might be dignified by that name.

Primary education is obligatory. In 1910 there were about 500 schools, with 43,000 pupils, in the country. For higher education there exist a university, with faculties of law and medicine, several national colleges and a diocesan seminary, besides schools of agriculture, music, design, mechanical engineering, languages and so forth. The republic has also its military academy.

There is no doubt that with its fine climate, its splendid resources, its beauty of vegetation and its magnificent waterways, Paraguay might in course of time become a very flourishing republic and an agreeable country to live in.

Charles Warren Currier.

Washington, D. C.

THOUGHTS NEW AND OLD ABOUT JUSTICE.

IN THE letter of Pope St. Clement to the Corinthians (c. v.) St. Paul is described as "preaching Justice all over the world;" and the Apostle himself in his four epistles, written respectively to Romans, Corinthians and Galatians, used the same word in its different modifications about two hundred times. It means in his mouth the supernatural life of grace; and about that we have nothing further to say in the present discussion, though in itself it is very important, being the purpose of Christ's mission. Under the distress of much keenly felt wrongfulness prophet and psalmist had long cried for some leader to set the people right. Thus Jeremias in his inspired vision looked beyond the mere bringer-back from the Babylonian captivity when he spoke the words, "Behold, I will raise up unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall do justice and judgment upon earth, and His name shall be the Lord our Justice" (xxii., 5, 6). This idea pervades the Old Testament, which also (Josue x., 13) quotes an extra canonical "Book of Jasher," the "Just One."

Another meaning of Justice not to our present purpose lies in the use of it to signify all virtue under its common aspect of righteousness. "It is not a single division of virtue," says Aristotle, "but the whole of virtue." ("Eth. Nic.," V. III.) In this sense the just man is the perfect man; to fulfill all justice is to perform all duty and even more.[1]

A third signification to be set aside is that of Plato when he makes Justice mean individually the perfect adjustment of all man's parts in one whole and socially the perfect adjustment of all the individuals in the civil state, so that each serves in his own peculiar way the common weal. No part should interfere with or oppose another part; each man should mind his own concerns and not meddle with those of others, which would be to become what Plato calls a "polypragmatist" or a "periurgist"—a kind of busybody whom St. Paul also condemns. (I. Thess. iv., 11; I. Tim. v., 13.) What the Apostle reprobated was not strenuous action, of which he himself gave a prime example. (Acts xviii.) Aristotle is thought not himself to have written the very imperfectly constructed book

[1] Many of our modern books on ethics pay no attention to justice as a special virtue, and hence make little of it; it gets but occasional mention. Thus Mr. Muirhead is content with saying: "Justice before generosity. Generosity, it is implied, presupposes justice. On the other hand, justice presupposes generosity, which is only justice adequately conceived" (pp. 199, 200, second edition). There is another bare mention of the word, pp. 196-201. Professor James Seth is equally casual on justice and generosity ("Ethical Principles").

in the Ethics which treats of Justice. (Book V.) There the Pythagorean idea of equality is given a fundamental place; but it cannot be upheld as a rigid equation between all its terms or in the figure of the square which was used by Pythagoras for the purpose. In the equation $\frac{2}{4}=\frac{2000}{4000}$, if the numbers on the right hand could speak for themselves, they would protest strongly against being reduced in magnitude to 2 and 4 respectively by a process which, in the interest of mere proportion, the mathematician would carry out without a qualm in order to get the identity $\frac{2}{4}=\frac{2}{4}$. Even on the ground of quantity objection might be raised, while quality would increase the objection indefinitely. When then Aristotle declares that the just is the equal and the unjust the unequal he does not mean an absolutely dead level of treatment all round among men.[2]

In Book V., c. ii., he makes a rough division of justice more or less into public and private; he calls the two parts respectively distributive and dioretic, which latter word is by some translated corrective and by others directive. By the first the distributers of good things to the citizens will make a fair distribution, while by the latter the citizens between themselves will be fair in their several dealings. This imperfect sketch was taken up and improved by the scholastics among whom were discriminated, not with absolute uniformity of explanation, (1) *distributive* justice, whereby rulers gave to their subjects equitable shares in the emoluments and the burdens so far as it belonged to the State to apportion those things desirable and undesirable. (2) Then came *legal* justice, making each citizen contributive to the common welfare according to his degree. (3) Lastly, came commutative justice between citizens as equals in their transactions one with another. If the king entered a retail shop to purchase a trifling article, he would in that relationship be the equal of the vendor, and would have to observe commutative justice by paying the sale value of the article, as any of his subjects would do. Here equality of justice is seen in its fullest degree, in the rendering of *quid pro quo*.

For practical purposes Aristotle takes men as Hobbes did, namely, as equal, so that no individual has an out-and-out preëminence over all the rest, after the manner of Nietzsche's *Uebermensch,* which term, perhaps, we shall with least ambiguity translate by the hybrid "superman." In a playful way, nevertheless, Aristotle does lay down the position of the superhuman individual to be theoretically that of ruler by innate right over all his inferiors. "Wherever there is a whole family, or an individual, that is superexcellent above the rest, it is just that such family or individual should reign supreme.

[2] His derivation of dike, justice, from dicha, as if it were a dichotomy into two equal parts, is a mistake in etymology.

Assuredly it is not proper to put to death or to outlaw or even to ostracize them, or to make them take their turn in being subject.[3] They stand not as parts to the whole, but as whole to parts." ("Politic" iii., 17.) In an earlier chapter of the same book (ch. xiii.) Aristotle had not been so promising in regard to the supermen; for after allowing all their claims to rule and to be laws to themselves, he added that as a hard fact "democratic States ostracize their exceptionally superior individuals. Similarly the Argonauts would not take Hercules with them; they left him in the lurch. Again, the heads of overtopping ears of corn are cut off. A choirmaster will not give a place in his chorus to a singer who has a voice overpoweringly stronger and better than the voices of the rest." Still, as to justice, there is none of it in this political practice of ostracizing the very prominent citizens who appear as supermen. Instead of regarding the interests of the State, these politicians have used such ostracism for party purposes. If the superman should rise to be fairly king, then as "a law to himself" he would have a light burden from legal justice, but in *distributive* and *commutative* justice he ought to be very exact and beneficent, with much self-sacrifice. In actual order of facts,[4] not exactly supermen, but men of ability do come to the head of affairs in a crisis by a sort of natural selection.

One good point in Aristotle is that with the Greek love of reasoned procedure he insists upon justice as an intelligently calculated sort of equality, not a mechanical balance in which no decent equality between parts could be guaranteed. Some modern historians lay too much stress upon the outcome of mere social or economical pressures as determinant of individual positions in the State. Take the case of the trade guilds which once were suitable for business and now are not—at least not in the narrowness of the old form. This transition we can admit without giving the account of the matter which Professor Ashley proposes in his view of rights as unstable adjustments of forces. "Given small industrial undertakings, given the current philosophical, ethical and religious ideas, the guild system was inevitable." If this may stand what follows is more objectionable: "To ask whether or not it was justifiable

[3] For average men justice requires, according to Aristotle, that they should take it turn and turn about to govern and be governed.

[4] As a fact, such supermen as we get generally have their counterbalancing defects. Sir T. Coulston, writing on unsoundness of mind, says: "The genius is the god amongst men. His work and his thought have been the redemption or the curse of the race. He occurs rarely, and his advent is unexpected. Among his relations there are apt to be a disproportionate number of cranks, imbeciles and mentally unsound persons. It commonly takes several generations for the world to understand him. He used often to be put to death. He is sometimes entirely sane, but often enough he has a dash of brain irritability."

is to apply a standard that is not applicable." ("Economic History," Part II., Vol. I., chap. ii.) As the author himself narrates, the mediæval guilds were penetrated through and through with moral and religious ideas, and were organized with care for justice; they were not mechanical products of social pressures.

To supplement his theory of justice, Aristotle, aware of the principle *summum jus summa injuria,* adds the modifying influence of friendship and of *epieikeia,* which latter Matthew Arnold translated "sweet reasonableness." Moreover, into his rhetoric (I., 14) he introduced a passage quite in the spirit of his "Ethics and Politics," but directly referring to the mitigations of rigor in private dealings, and if also in law, then rather in positive than in natural law. He gives as means of securing the *epieikeia*[5] which suits human infirmities, to look rather at the mind of the legislator than at the letter of the law; to regard not so much the need of the offender as his intention; not so much his isolated act as his general conduct; not so much his permanent self; to dwell rather on the benefits than on the injuries one has received; rather on the good that has been done to one than on the good oneself has done; and to call in the arbiter rather than the appeal judge.

Again, in his "Ethics" (V. X.) Aristotle tells how equity tempers Justice and is its higher form, qualifying its generalities by the necessary adaptations to the concrete; acting as the Pretor did in Rome, and as the Lord Chancellor used to do in England in his character of "Keeper of the King's Conscience." The hard stickler for the legal maximum—the *acribodikaios* ("Eth. Nic.," V. XIV)—is condemned as brutal, as a hard-and-fast man who will not measure the angular surfaces of his fellow-creatures by a flexible rule, which is the only rule wherewith to measure the cyclopean edifice of vast human society. The spirit of the Beatitudes in the Gospel is so far anticipated that the principle is formulated of bearing injuries, "allowing oneself to be wronged." ("Rhet." i., 13.)[6] No one will lead a decent life who seeks wholly to fight against that condition of human existence. Of course, there must be some judgment in

[5] St. Paul is large in his demand for this virtue, not only in inward disposition, but also in outward exhibition. "Let your epieikeia be known to all men" (Philip. iv., 5). The English versions of Scripture give "moderation," "modesty," "forbearance;" a French version gives "douceur," and a German gives "Lindigkeit." As to the "extenuating circumstances" recommended by Aristotle, Green holds that these directly should not enter into the administration of law, whose aim is to create adequate fear as a deterrent. "The notion that the State should, if it could, adjust the amount of punishment to the moral wickedness of the crime rests on a false view of the relation of the State to morality" ("Principles of Political Obligation," n. 196). Aristotle is not dealing with law courts as such.

[6] The spieikes is a man willing at times to take "less than his just share," whereas the unjust man takes "more than his share." (*Cf.* "Mag. Moral.," II., 1.)

the relaxation of legal rights; ours is a poor world if Huxley's description of it is true, that it tries by a loud sentimentality to make up for its folly and its injustice. Even though we cannot exactly frame another law of equity as definite as the law of justice, strained," still we may be and ought to be judiciously merciful, not strained," still we may be and ougth to be judiciously merciful, not closed to mercy, saying,

> Mercy but murders, pardoning those that kill.[7]

Now to hit the golden mean; how nicely to qualify *la justice* by *la justesse,* which has been translated "the real right thing in good taste," is a matter wherein we can only do our best and expect to fail sometimes on both sides of the balance. It is left to the free will what use is made, good or bad, of kind allowances by the receivers of mercy. In the play of give-and-take, where no exact *quid pro quo* is our aim, we can be more generous than can those whose purpose is business and who are large employers of labor. Their position is far from easy; if they are not exacting, they are ill served, and if they are over-exacting, their servants are ill mastered. St. Paul, while enjoining obedience and religious motives on those who serve (Colos. iii., 22) is not content simply with telling masters to be just; he adds that they must also display equity, a disposition to be regulated by the thought that they also have a Master in heaven (v., 1). This is the very opposite of the pagan relationship in which bare justice to slaves was not acknowledged, for they were not regarded as having the dignity of human rights—at least not by many who wrote and acted in the matter, and were merciless to bondsmen as infra-human beings, as living instruments that had just the quality of being animate with a higher sort of animality than that of the brute beast. Christianity vindicated their manhood and demanded for them a charity beyond justice, always with due regard to possible abuse in the way of idleness or ill service. A Roman legalist of the Empire saw the aspect of slavery in which it was *contra naturam* even when the masters were good in the fulfillment of that justice which yet lacks the fuller humanity. In the relation of parents to children this lack may also be felt. In Charlotte Bronté's "Shirley" we have the defect painted in an uncle, the rector of his parish, who took charge of his niece and treated her as he would have treated a daughter of his own, had he possessed one. The niece says of her

[7] "Romeo and Juliet," act III., scene 1. Kant, who depreciates sentiment, calls on legislators not to adulterate justice with a benevolent affection, inasmuch as "there can be no obligation to be kindly out of pity," while a contagious sympathy is dangerous in the treatment of the undeserving. ("Metaphysics of Morality: Elementology of Ethics," Part II., ch. I.)

hard guardian: "He is rather scrupulously equitable than truly just, if you can understand such superfine distinctions." "Oh, yes," answered Shirley; "good nature implies indulgence, geniality, warmth of heart; genuine justice is the offspring of sympathy and considerateness, of which I can conceive that your uncle is quite innocent."

A few modern representatives of doctrine on justice outside the Catholic and even the orthodoxly Protestant school will show some aspects which may probably be criticized.

(1) John Stuart Mill felt that justice is a virtue calling for a special treatment beyond his utilitarian account of the virtues in general, and accordingly in his book on "Utilitarianism" he devoted to it a chapter. Therein he is not content with Hobbes, who founds it on contract (Leviathan, ch. xv.), nor with Hume, who thinks it a utilitarian need for our society, but quite out of place where there is "perfect moderation" ("Essay on Justice"); he feels that more must be said to account for the unique place it holds in the human heart. He begins with a Socratic-like enumeration of cases to which men apply the name justice. He finds it to cover the legal and the moral requirement, the matter of good or ill desert, the keeping of faith, the answering to expectations, which that man does not satisfy who takes benefits, but makes no return. Forming now an induction from his examples, Mill gathers the characteristics common to all and specific of their moral value. These are that the characteristics of justice lie in (a) what specially we should like to see men compelled to do; (b) what begets "perfect obligation"[8] in definiteness as to persons and as to things to be done; (c) what moves a peculiar sentiment which is that of resentment moralized by the fact that its purpose is not selfish, but reaches out to the common good which is concerned in every act of just dealing, whether voluntary or enforced. Summarizing results, Mill concludes: "The idea of justice supposes two things, a rule of conduct and a sentiment which sanctions the rule. The first must be supposed common to all mankind and intended for their good; the second is a desire that punishment should be suffered by those that infringe the rule. There is involved in addition the conception of some definite person whose rights are impaired.[9] The animal desire to retaliate becomes an enlarged sympathy for all human suffering from injustice." Here Mill hopes to get beyond mere

[8] Kant calls the strict or perfect obligation what manifestly proves self-contradictory when a reversal of it is treated as a universal principle, and that so convincingly that the unfitness is clear and no exception is defensible. ("Grundwerk of Metaphysik," ch. II.)

[9] Roman law insisted that "obligatio" should be definite in its incidence on persons and things: it was a chain between two fixed points of dependence—vinculum obligationes.

expediency; so he introduces, besides the morality of seeking the universal happiness, a peculiar sentiment, a feeling of resentment against what is a definite wrong to somebody, or would be a definite wrong unless prevented.

With all this painstaking he does not improve on the old definition of Ulpian: *Constans et perpetua voluntas jus suum cuique tribuendi.* As we are dealing with ultimate ideas, there must be also an appearance of tautology, when into the definition is introduced *jus* and *suum*; of course, what is a man's own or his right he ought in justice to have.

Mill explains himself further at the close of his treatise on the "Subjection of Women." His prose attitude was far from the poetic one of Patmore, who believed that the male conscience should rule the female and that the weak should lean upon the strong. For the security of modern society Mill wants something more trustworthy than the chivalric idea that the strong must protect the weak. When women are called upon still to rely on such support, he declares it insufficient. "The main foundation of moral life in modern lives must be justice and prudence," which still leave a secondary position to chivalry or generosity. What Mill felt was that while the honor principle might carry some chosen souls to heights far beyond "justice and prudence," still these two were the chief principles on which the multitude should rely and without which even the élite should not be.[10] It was not as a practical moralist, but as an ideal physicist that Aristotle taught optimism when he extended his principle that "nature does nothing in vain," "or unreasonably" into "nature in all things always aspires to the best."[11] The tendency exists in the soul, but its issue into action is too precarious to allow us to rest on it without the application of less exalted standards for the attainment of subordinate ends. We cannot truly and profitably tell mankind at large what Jowett said, probably without an exact weighing of his words, that Justice requires us to do the best we can for others.[12]

Coventry Patmore was brought to a sense of danger in optimism. "The counsels, the keeping of which is ordinarily the reward of long fidelity, seemed to me as binding as the precepts, and I was best in doing nothing by halves. I made the most extravagant and pitiable mistake, praying for example eight or ten hours a day in order to fulfill the precept 'Pray always,' and relapsing into periods of exhaustion, during which I hardly prayed at all." This

[10] The character is known of one who wants to be just, but is conscious of lacking prudence and judgment, and so follows impulses without rational guidance.

[11] On "Generation and Corruption," II., 10.

[12] Kant also said: "Wohltätig zu sein wo man kann ist Pflicht."

is a bad way of fulfilling all justice. One who in many points agrees with Mill's "Utilitarianism" is H. Sidgwick, who copies his guide in several of his views about Justice. Trying to take this, not in its generic character as inclusive of all virtue, but as a specific virtue having its own peculiar excellence, he yet gives it a much wider scope than suits the usual tradition and is convenient for clear treatment. In it he embraces human law and the claims of rationally grounded expectations which arise from the usages of society, from tacit understandings and from ties of gratitude. He finds that the changes in social ideas from age to age introduce a disturbing element; he emphasizes the conflict between conservatism and innovation in regard to personal liberties and to the requitals proper for merits and demerits. Sometimes also defects of fitness negative the claims of merit in the bestowal of a post. But apart from such conflicting elements, the mere discrimination in itself of actions according to their value puzzles his calculating powers, while retribution according to the worth of motives is further perplexing. Thus he surveys detail after detail till he comes to a sort of rule founded on the utility of encouraging or discouraging actions with a view to the public good. "I do not see how the question can be met by an analysis of our common notion of Justice. To deal with such points at all satisfactorily we have, I conceive, to adopt quite a different line of reasoning; we have to ask not what services of a certain kind are intrinsically worth, but what reward can procure them, and whether the rest of society gains by the services more than the equivalent reward.[13] We have, in short, to give up as impractical the construction of an ideally just social order in which services are rewarded in exact proportion to their intrinsic value.[14] A similar rule has been given for the use of praise. Praise actions which you ought to promote and will thereby promote to the gain of society. It is clear that such a style of treatment is one of terrestrial expedience and leaves out the inner sanctities of justice as a virtue having more than the utilitarian value which lies in the promotion of social welfare.

The final conclusion of the chapter is a confession that for practical application in social life no very definite rule for human guidance has been discovered. "The results of this examination of Justice may be summed up as follows: The prominent element in Justice as ordinarily concerned is a kind of equality—that is, im-

[13] Here justice is being narrowed down to a question of promoting the common good by incentives to service—a very narrow outlook.

[14] "Methods of Ethics," Book III., chap. V., sec. 5. We see how in "Ethics" the author's chapter on justice ignores the full scope of its ethical definition.

partiality[15] in the observance and the enforcement of certain general rules allotting good or evil to individuals. But when we have clearly distinguished this element, we see that the definition of the virtue for practical guidance is left obviously incomplete. Inquiring further for the right general principles of distribution, we find that the common notion of Justice includes, besides the principle of reparation for injury, the quite distinct and divergent elements, Conservative Justice and Ideal Justice.[16] The former is realized, first, in observance of law and contracts and definite understandings and in the enforcement of such penalties for the violation of these as have been legally determined and announced, and, secondly, in the fulfillment of natural and normal expectations—an obligation of a somewhat indefinite kind. The other element, the Ideal Justice, is still more difficult to define, for there seem to be two quite distinct conceptions of it embodied respectively in individualistic and Socialistic ideals of a political community. The first of these takes the realization of Freedom as its ultimate standard, which does not give a practical basis for social construction without certain arbitrary definitions and limitations. Moreover, a society in which Freedom is realized as far as is feasible does not completely suit our sense of justice. *Prima facie*, this is more satisfied by the Socialist Ideal of Distribution founded on the principle of requiting desert; but when we try to make the principle precise, we find ourselves again involved in great difficulties, and similar perplexities beset the working out of criminal justice on the same principle."

Thirdly, T. H. Green in his "Lectures on Political Obligation" gives us less right than Sidgwick, who professes to be dealing with Ethics, that we should expect of him an account of justice as a moral virtue. The direct end of politics as such is good order in civil society; political justice may therefore be described within the limits of this direct purpose. A rejector of Utilitarianism on its wider ground, Green, from his narrower outlook, defines justice as "the habit of mind which in our dealings with others leads us to respect the complex of social conditions which is necessary to help the individual to realize his capacity for contributing to the social good."[17] Ultimately he would on his monistic basis identify this particular social good with the good of the universal Being; but that identification does not concern the immediate purpose of the lectures, which have a mundane interest at heart, namely, that social welfare of which the author was an active promoter. The view that strongly struck him was that injustice to an individual

[15] Adam Smith used the test of the "Impartial Spectator."

[16] Aristotle: diorthotic justice.

[17] "Lectures," n. 186.

hindered his full contribution to human well-being; it was not so much the individual who was injured as his serviceableness to the community. This is the State's outlook upon its subjects, to preserve their due freedom of action as civic units in a coöperative society. At the back of all this lies a presupposed good of morality. "The highest moral goodness is an attribute of character in so far as it issues in acts done for the sake of their goodness, not for the sake of any pleasure or any satisfaction of desire which they bring to the agent. But it is impossible that an act should be done for the sake of its goodness unless it has been previously contemplated as good for some other reason than that which consists in its being done for the sake of its goodness." (Pages 29-30.)

Green departs from the Utilitarianism of Mill; but he has a curious agreement with him in being at once a determinist and in maintaining that an offender cannot in Justice be punished for what he could not help doing. While the former says "the punishable act must be one which the agent could have avoided,[18] the latter speaks of "the admitted principle that it is unjust to punish any one for what he cannot help," and he further repudiates explicitly the Owenite theory that no man should be punished because no man could do otherwise than he does. It requires some mental manœuvring to defend together the two positions that all actions are determined by character and circumstances beyond a free alternative, and that wrong actions are punishable on condition that there were possible alternatives and the misdeeds were avoidable, which they were admitted not to be in madmen or even in intelligent men of irresistible impulses, such as that to drink. Sidgwick is involved in the same discordancy of theory. "I should admit that the ordinary notion of merit becomes inapplicable on the determinant hypothesis; but I do not see that perfection becomes less an end to be aimed at because we cease to regard its attainment as meritorious." (Book I., ch. v., sec. 3, note 2, in page 68). The remark on perfection is true and is verified in the Divine Activity; but the justification of punishment is still left to be made and observation is not to the point.

What these authors say about the nature of retributive punishment touches on an important consideration in the subject of justice —how far it includes a right of retaliation. Mill has nothing specially concessive on the point, neither has Sidgwick; they are both utilitarian in their penalties. But Green ventures somewhat further when beyond the Utilitarian end which social authority has before it in punishing the sin of the person punished he adds that

[18] "Lectures," n. 186. *Cf.* 185: "A punishment is unjust unless the agent might have prevented it."

the offender ought to "recognize his punishment as just, as his due or desert, as the natural expression of the idea of public good." He ought to see that punishment is "his error returning on himself"[19] in the sense that it is "the necessary outcome of his action in a society governed by the concept of rights." (N. 186.) This account does not reach as far as that avenging justice which does not belong to private individuals and which modern States wholly or largely disclaim, but which at least assert for God as the Assigner of the supreme sanction of His inviolable law. He cannot rightly allow that immorality or a defiance of Himself and His sanctity should lead to happiness as morality does, as if there were an abysmal gulf between the two extremes, "the great gulf fixed" between Dives in hell and Lazarus in the bosom of Abraham. No man should be able to boast with impunity, "I have done evil all my life and it has brought no final misery, though it was never repaired." The preventive and the corrective use of penalties are what human law chiefly aims at; and if you say exclusively, at any rate you cannot thence infer that the justice of God is limited to prevention and correction. Dr. Frowler seems to be speaking without full advertence when he limits justice to the prevention of positive and definite harm. "Actions can be called just or unjust only if they prevent or inflict positive harm. Law is transcending its functions when it attempts to promote good or reward the virtuous." This is too much after the way of Herbert Spencer. What is true is that civil law seldom offers rewards, yet sometimes it does; for instance, for a large family in a State where population is ruinously declining, it ought positively to promote much good by wise legislation.

Little need be said in development of the view here advocated concerning the nature of justice. It is explained, as is all virtue, by the principle of insight into the becomingness and the misbecoming of actions in reasonable men. Like obedience, it is a virtue which regards not self, but others as the subject to be benefited, but unlike obedience, it is not towards superiors only, but also towards equals and inferiors. Its aim is *suum cuique*—to every man his own of good or evil, of reward or of punishment, of property or other benefit or of mulct and other detriment. Man has an *own* or the rights of ownership, because he has a rational nature with moral exigences, in a way not possible to dead matter or to live plants or animals. So much about justice is clear in general. In detail the particular cases have to be judged on their own merits, to see how the balance is to be determined; often it

[19] That is the idea which Green does not allow to have its full bearing, as did the Greek dramatists in their assertion that the illdoer must suffer for his illdoing an ill effect.

is the puzzle of some law courts, even when all the facts are clear, how to settle what belongs of right to whom. Only a positive award by authority can bring some disputes to a conclusion. To this extent the right has to be made, not found. Not alone material objects come under the regulation of justice, but also moral and spiritual objects. He is a thief who steals a reputation; such a defrauder has no warrant for exalting himself over the vulgar pilferer of purses. God also has His just demands, and of these a prominent one is that of receiving religious worship. As supremely adorable He has the right to the cult of *latreia*. The specific quality of religion as such is not justice, but justice enforces it as the due of honor payable to the Divinity. Here a secularist, who perhaps claims to be a high pattern of justice for his moral conduct, in which no homage to the Lord Creator is acknowledged, becomes flagrantly unjust objectively in deed, if not subjectivelyin conscience concerning the deed. There is sometimes confusion in the advocacy of conscience, as though it were set in antithesis to the admission of divine demands; this is sometimes called autonomy in morals as opposed to heteronomy. Probably the words reported of Lord Tennyson lie under some haziness as to their heteronomous relation: "It is impossible to imagine that the Almighty will ask you when you come before Him in the next life what your particular form of creed was, but the question will rather be, 'Have you been true to yourself?'" Justice in the strict meaning is not to self, though Plato makes that one-half of its meaning in the looser sense; but to yeurself?'" Justice in the strict meaning is not to self, though Aristotle is more correct in referring justice to "another person," which otherness we extend most of all to God as the personal Being who holds supreme rights over all mankind. Mill was in one way so purposely trained up to despise feeling as a factor in knowledge and to reject all theology that recognition of a God of Justice was shut out from him, and he stands in deep contrast to a poet like Patmore, who says that he started with a religion of inner mystic feeling to which Catholic dogma at last furnished clear forms. His challenge to his readers on behalf of his feeling is: "If any of them can honestly say that he ever actively adopted an abstract truth so long as his feelings, however obviously unreasonable, were in the main against it, let him cast the first stone at me." In the virtue of Justice Mill did allow a feeling to be involved, but not of the divine; it was a feeling of resentment moralized by its object being converted from self-seeking to universal welfare[20] conceived as needing to be purged of injustice

[20] Green also thinks that resentment loses its evil in ceasing to be individual. "There is a popular wish to serve out a cold-blooded mur-

by an animosity directed to its suppression. Such humanism, though it possesses its beneficial scope, is one which exercises on the conception of justice an injurious limiting influence. Again to quote Patmore: "The emotions of modern humanitarianism stand in the way of recognizing God." And going beyond natural ethics, St. Paul prays for himself, "that I may win Christ and be found in Him, not having my own justice, but that which is through faith in Christ." (Philip. iii., 8-9; Gal. v., 19-22.) The secularist does not pray—that is out of his sphere; but he strives to have his own justice acceptable before his own fellow-creatures, for their and his peculiar benefit and for no ulterior judge. This is not justice *suum cuique,* because it leaves out God, whose claim is the highest demand to be dealt with equitably.

JOHN RICKABY, S. J.

Stonyhurst, England.

THE "KAIL GLEN" MONKS OF SCOTLAND.

"Ordinale Vallis Caulium Conventus." London: Longmans, 1900.
"History of the Religious House of Pluscardyn." By S. R. Macphail. Edinburgh, 1881.
"Charters of the Priory of Beauly." By E. Chisholm Batten. Grampian Club, 1877.

SO LITTLE is generally known in these days of the now extinct religious Order of Valliscaulium (often styled the Valliscaulian Order) that its very title will be strange to readers not greatly attracted by antiquarian lore. Yet in its day the order was not without renown; it flourished through six centuries and possessed as many as thirty monasteries in different countries. That it has been more or less lost sight of is due to the disappearance of its chief records during the tempest of the French Revolution; for the mother house and the majority of its dependencies were situated in French territory. Three of its houses were in Scotland, and of two of them considerable remains are yet to be seen; this will avail as sufficient reason for a brief treatment of the subject here.

As in many other instances, the order took its title from the locality in which the mother house was founded. This was a valley in Burgundy, not far from Louvigny; the title given to this valley in old French is said to have been "Val des Choues" (Valley of Owls), from an antique word denoting those birds, which would

---

derer. It is really quite different from popular revenge, because it is not egoistic. Such indignation is inseparable from interest in social well-being." ("Lectures on Political Obligation," n. 83.)

be probably numerous in that wooded district. This derivation, however, is not generally accepted. The mediæval form was "Val des Choux," which in Latin was rendered "Valliscaulium." The name is thought to have originated with the vegetables grown by the founder and his first disciples for their chief sustenance. It is from the latter derivation that the order was often designated by Scottish tongues "Kail Glen Monks."

The Order of Valliscaulium owed its origin to a lay Brother of the Carthusian monastery of Louvigny towards the end of the twelfth century. This religious, known as Viard—sometimes written Vido, or Guido—was animated with a desire for more perfect solitude and seclusion than was afforded him as a lay Brother with the Carthusians; with the permission of his superiors, therefore, he retired to a cave in the wooded valley in question, and for some time led the life of a hermit, unknown to men. When eventually discovered by the inhabitants of the surrounding country, his life of extraordinary penance and austerity, evidence of the sanctity of his soul, became noised abroad. His fame attracted the notice of Odo III., Duke of Burgundy, in whose territory the hermitage was situated. That nobleman paid Viard frequent visits, and when about to engage in a perilous war, begged the prayers of the holy man for the success of his enterprise, promising, in case of victory, to build there a monastery and church. This promise he later on fulfilled.

As in most instances of the kind, the first buildings were of small dimensions, and the land belonging to the humble monastery was restricted in extent. According to Hélyot ("Histoire des Ordres Monastiques"), an ancient inscription in the church recorded the entrance of Viard into the new buildings on November 2, 1193.

Many fervent disciples hastened to join the new institute; their way of life was regulated by constitutions drawn up by Viard and approved of by Innocent III. in 1204. From the tenor of the Bull addressed by that Pope to the prior and community, it is clear that the rule was adapted from that of St. Benedict, though there were considerable differences, suggested by Carthusian usages. A later Bull of Honorius III., dated 1224, is proof of this. "Beyond the rule of Blessed Benedict," says the Pontiff, "which you have professed to observe, as far as human frailty permits, you mention certain special practices of your own." It seems probable that all that was Benedictine in the spirit of the order was derived from the usages of the Cistercians, who professed to follow the rule of St. Benedict in its primitive austerity. Thus the habit was white, like that of Citeaux; perpetual abstinence from animal food was maintained; a deep devotion to the Mother of God was inculcated

—one feature of it being the dedication to her of all monasteries as primary titular; St. Bernard was to be specially honored in the liturgy—all these practices are evidence of a Cistercian spirit. There is, however, one point worthy of notice, which is not to be found in the rule of Citeaux—a Benedictine monk who desired to join the Order of Valliscaulium might be received without further probation.

There can be little doubt that the idea of the founder of the Valliscaulians was to make such changes from Carthusian observance—in which he had been trained—as might render his order cenobitical rather than eremetical. Hence while they preserved many Carthusian practices—such as wearing a hair-shirt continually, reciting privately the offices of the Blessed Virgin and of the Dead, keeping perpetual enclosure, laboring each in his own little plot of garden ground and the like—they took meals together in a common refectory, slept in a common dormitory, assembled in choir for the whole divine office and the like, according to ordinary monastic usage.

One practice peculiar to their order was the dedication of all monasteries to St. John the Baptist as well as to the Blessed Virgin. The reason given for this custom is that "the first father and founder of the order came from the church of Louvigny, which is dedicated to Blessed Mary and St. John the Baptist."[1]

In course of time, by the liberality of the Dukes of Burgundy and other generous benefactors, the possessions of the monastery of Val des Choux were greatly increased. The primitive buildings, too, needed enlargement and restoration; a new church and monastery therefore came into being. From the remains still extant, it would appear that these were erected during the early part of the fourteenth century, when the order had already spread abroad. All dependent houses were subject to the superior of Val des Choux, who—in accordance with Carthusian usage—never assumed the title of abbot, but was known as the grand prior; superiors of daughter houses were styled prior. The order never spread beyond France except to Scotland and into Germany; as regards the latter country no records remain of the localities of such foundations; the special legislation for the priors "de Alemania" in the Ordinale is the only proof of their existence.[2] The number of monks and lay Brothers in each community was limited to twenty.

As it is not to our purpose to follow the history of the order in general, it will be sufficient to give a few particulars merely, before passing on to the consideration of the Scottish monasteries, which are the special object of this article.

---

[1] Ordinale, p. 94.
[2] Ordinale, p. 119.

The rigor of the primitive rule was relaxed by a Bull of Honorius III., in 1224, in accordance with the petition of superiors; it was left to the discretion of the members of the general chapter to legislate to that effect. In the course of centuries the observance became still more mitigated, owing, in great measure, to the introduction of that scourge of monasteries, the appointment of superiors *in commendam,* which consisted in the appointment of a mere nominal superior, frequently some favorite of a monarch or of the patron; this personage, often a layman, contented himself with drawing the revenues, and left the monks to their own devices. Matters had become so relaxed by the early part of the seventeenth century that the Diocesan, Gilbert de Montmorin, Bishop of Langres, was made by the Holy See superior general of the whole order, with a view to radical reformation. About the middle of the same century Dom Dorothée Jallontz, the then grand prior, conceived the idea of renewing the original observance of the Cistercians by the acceptance of some of the principles of the Trappists—instituted about a hundred years previously. Accordingly, he brought about the union of Val des Choux with the Abbey of Sept-Fons, in which the severe way of life thus begun lasted until the French Revolution swept away religious orders from the land, together with most of their records.

SCOTTISH HOUSES.

The Valliscaulian foundations in Scotland were all made about the year 1230, while the order was still in its primitive fervor. William de Malvoisin, one of the most distinguished prelates of his day, who had been successively Bishop of Glasgow, Primate, Chancellor of the kingdom and Papal Legate, is credited with the introduction of this order into the country. A man of great learning and zeal, he had been chief counsellor to William the Lion, and continued to enjoy royal favor under his successor, Alexander II., whom the Bishop had baptized. In 1215 the prelate took part in the Fourth Council of the Lateran, together with other Scottish Bishops. It is probable that on his journey through France, where he had relatives, he became acquainted with the newly founded order, and in the hope that the example of these fervent monks might tend towards the improvement in the lives and discipline of ecclesiastics, which had formed one subject of the council's debates, resolved to bring about their introduction into Scotland. The idea would be strengthened by the deliberations of the provincial council of the Scottish clergy, in 1225, upon the revival of fervor and discipline.

As the three Scottish houses were founded almost simultaneously,

we may treat them in alphabetical order, since neither enjoyed priority of rank.

Ardchattan Priory was founded by Duncan MacDougal, ancestor of the Lords of Lorn. It has been suggested that the foundation was made as a peace offering to Alexander II. and his chief adviser, Bishop Malvoisin. Alexander had made himself master of Argyle in 1221, after the rebellion of the Lord of Argyle, and had constituted it a sheriffdom; in this division he had not included Lorn, but had required MacDougal to hold it of the Crown instead of the Lord of the Isles. The erection of the See of Argyle, with the island of Lismore as its centre, had already been accomplished about the year 1200, and the establishment of the priory—a sister of two other houses in distant parts of the kingdom—was calculated to help to bring the western district into closer ecclesiastical union with the rest of Scotland, and thus strengthen the power of the Crown through the influence of the Church.

From the descriptions given by those acquainted with the district, the Priory of Ardchattan must have stood amid scenery not often surpassed in picturesque beauty—even in beautiful Argyleshire. It stood on the north shore of Loch Etive, one of the many sea lochs which break up the western coast. The principal buildings looked over the water and had an extensive view towards the south. Of the loch itself, Dorothy Wordsworth has left a striking description: "The loch is of considerable width; but the mountains are so very high that, whether we were close under them or looked from one shore to the other, they maintained their dignity . . . On our right was Ben Cruachan (3,611 feet), rising directly from the lake, and on the opposite side another mountain . . . craggy and exceedingly steep, with wild wood growing between the rocks and stones . . . Some of the rocky basins and little creeks among the rocks were as still as a mirror, and they were so beautiful with the reflection of the orange-colored seaweed, growing on the stones or rocks, that a child, with a child's delight in gay colors, might have danced with joy at the sight of them. . . . We saw enough to give us the most exquisite delight—the powerful lake, which filled the large vale, roaring torrents, clouds floating on the mountain sides, sheep that pastured there, sea birds and land birds."[3]

In that wild and picturesque spot the founder raised the priory church, whose scanty remains show it to have been of early English style, and probably cruciform in plan, as there are indications of the piers which supported a central tower. The choir must have measured about 66 feet in length. Like so many other ecclesiastical

[3] "Tour in Scotland," edited by Principal Shairp (1874), p. 143, etc.

ruins in Scotland, these also have suffered so greatly from the wanton destruction of the buildings for the sake of the stone that scarcely anything remains except the ancient tombstones in the churchyard adjoining.

A writer of the seventeenth century, Father Augustin Hay, a canon regular of Scottish lineage, says of the founder of the priory: "He joined on to the church dwelling places moderate indeed and such as in a short time could be set up; there the fathers sighing for the habitations of their heavenly country, despised the comforts of their present life." All the monastic buildings have disappeared except one. This was originally constructed for the dwelling of the superior, and was known as the prior's lodge. It has been greatly enlarged to serve as a mansion house, though it bears traces of its monastic origin. Possibly many of the stones of the old church have been utilized in its construction since the Reformation. A wide extent of rich pasture land in the vicinity is still known as the Monks' Garden.

Ardchattan Priory has but scanty records. "Privileges," says Father Hay, "are said to have been granted to the holy house by the Pontiffs of Rome and the kings of Scotland. The place given to the devout monks was marked out, instead of landmarks, by fixed crosses."[4] From this it would appear that the priory enjoyed, like many other religious houses, the privilege of "sanctuary." A parliament was held there by Robert the Bruce in 1308, which is said to have been the last assembly of the kind in which the Gaelic tongue was spoken.

It would seem that the family of the founder, which had given more than one prior to the monastery, quietly retained possession when the Reformation overthrew all houses of religion in the land. If we are to credit the statement of a Protestant historian, the priory was ruled in succession by Somerled MacDougal and his two sons, Duncan and Dougal, about the end of the fifteenth century. This has led to much shaking of the head and lifting of hands on the part of Presbyterians in deprecation of the sad state of monastic morality. Mr. Chisholm Batten, however, has exploded the myth. By personal examination of the tombstones which had given rise to the extraordinary charge, he has been able to refute the slander, which had arisen from a faulty reading of inscriptions. He shows that the two brothers were indeed successive priors, but that the father's only connection with the monastery was that he had been buried, together with his wife, in the grave which later on received the remains of their sons.

The name Ardchattan, it may be noticed, is derived from the

[4] "Scotia Sacra." MS. in Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, p. 203.

Gaelic term signifying the "Hill of Cathan"—one of the ancient saints of the district, who flourished in the eighth century, and has given a name to several localities in the west of Scotland.

Beauly Priory, a second house of the same order, was founded by John Byset, of Lovat, in the parish of Kilmorach, Invernessshire, about ten miles west of Inverness. There is some dispute as to the origin of the name Beauly. Some derive it from the Gaelic words Beal, "mouth," and Abh, "river," a title describing its situation at the mouth of a river formed by the junction of two others, the Glass and the Farrar. But it certainly received the Latin designation of "Bellus Locus" as early as 1231, when it occurs in a Bull of Pope Gregory IX., addressed to the monks of the priory. It was not an uncommon title for a monastery situated amid beautiful surroundings either in France or in England. In the latter country we have Beaulieu, in Hampshire, pronounced locally like the village which sprang up round the Scottish priory and the river itself on which it stands—Bewley.

The situation of this monastery well deserves the designation "beautiful." The scenery is a combination of mountain, moor and forest pictures, with the curving river hastening to the sea, which penetrates into the low-lying lands for some seven miles and forms the Beauly Firth.

The founder was liberal in his gifts of land to the new monastery; other benefactors imitated his example in later years, until the priory became comparatively wealthy. It is interesting to note that William Byset, brother of the founder, granted to the monks the church of Abertarff, with all its rights and possessions, in 1231—a grant later confirmed by the Bishop of Moray, the Diocesan. Abertarff is the parish in which Fort Augustus is situated; we find history repeating itself in the gift to Benedictine monks by Simon, Lord Lovat, successor to the Bysets, more than six hundred years later, of the disused fort, situated close to the River Tarff, which gave its name to the locality.

The community at Beauly would seem to have been but small. There is record of a prior and six monks in 1245, and it is not probable—judging from the size of the church—that there were ever many more in residence. At the Reformation period they numbered eight only. So even was the tenor of their lives that few details of their history survive. In the daily routine—the regular keeping up of the divine office, the celebration of Masses, public and private, spiritual conferences, sacred and secular studies, transcription of manuscripts, labor in their separate garden plots and the multitudinous minor occupations of a religious house—

they led a life apart from the world outside, serving God and invoking His blessings upon their fellow-men.

Of one good work we have record; an old manuscript of the seventeenth or early eighteenth century speaks of one of the later priors as "a man most obliging in educating gentlemen's children" in the priory, which is styled the only school thereabouts. This shows that the great work of education, so dear to monks in all ages, was zealously practiced at Beauly.

One of the useful arts in which these monks were conspicuous was that of horticulture. The French gardener, William Lubias, brought to Kinloss by Abbot Reid in 1540, would doubtless employ his skill at Beauly also, for at that time the same superior ruled both houses. In any case, there was a well-tended garden there. It is recorded that the Lord Lovat of 1450, as an old manuscript says, "planted the first orchard in Lovat, having brought with him several spurs of pears and apples from the South, and helped to plant and enlarge the monks' orchard in Beauly."[5] The garden at Ardchattan has been already alluded to, and we shall have something to say about that at the third Scottish house of the order later on. It is interesting to find survivors of the ancient trees near the ruins of Beauly Priory as late as 1873, when Mr. Chisholm Batten saw a huge apple tree and the branch of a still larger jargonelle pear tree still flourishing.

A valuable adjunct to their landed property were the fishings in the river which the monks possessed. In connection with this subject we find the grand prior of the order remonstrating with the Beauly prior in 1506 because he had failed to send to Bruges, for the benefit of the mother house of Val des Choux, "fish called salmon," which had been promised by a former prior, either as a free gift or as a due.

Now and again the prior of Beauly would take leave of his brethren for a time, in order to travel to the mother house to take part in the deliberations of the chapter general. Such meetings were held every year, and all priors were bound to be present unless prevented by unavoidable circumstances; a special privilege was, however, granted to those of Scotland and Germany. The Scottish priors were required to attend once in four years, and this was afterwards mitigated to once in six years only; they made use of the monastery of Royal Pré, in Normandy, as a hospice on these journeys.

None of these priors, though several came of the family of Fraser—later on Lords of Lovat—took any part of distinction in affairs outside their monastery during the earlier centuries of its

[5] Chisholm Batten, p. 323.

existence. The most notable of them all was Robert Reid, who became in 1528 Abbot of Kinloss, the Cistercian monastery in Moray, and was nominated in 1530 prior of Beauly *in commendam.* A man of great learning and ability, he was employed by his sovereign in many important embassies and finished his days as Bishop of Orkney. But his greatest claim to distinction is the zeal he showed in the promotion of good discipline and sound learning in the houses he ruled.

Abbot Reid had procured the services of Ferrerius, an Italian scholar, as instructor of the young monks of Kinloss in classical studies; although he had sent one of the Kinloss monks as master to the five youths he had received into the Valliscaulian Order at Beauly, he later on transferred the same five to Kinloss, where they remained for three years under Ferrerius.

Not content with building up a spiritual edifice of solid learning, Abbot Reid would add to the beauty and extent of the material house. The tower of the church had been destroyed by lightning in 1542; he rebuilt it and constructed a new nave. Two years later he had erected a prior's house of noble dimensions in place of the old, decaying buildings which had previously served for that purpose. So noble was this house that the Book of Kinloss calls it "a palace."

The abbot dispensed hospitality to his neighbors, the Lovats, Mackenzies and others, with a liberal hand. His wise rule tended to increase respect for the priory in the minds of men, while it upheld the discipline and observance for the good of the community monastic. Many of the improvements carried out at Beauly were effected after he had been consecrated Bishop; for he never lost his interest in the welfare of his two monasteries as long as he retained the superiorship superiority over them. In 1553 he surrendered them to his brother's son, Walter Reid, then but a boy. He died in 1558, a year or two before the downfall of religion, and was spared the grief of witnessing his nephew's apostasy. It is not at all certain that Walter ever made his monastic profession; he may have been a mere titular superior. It is certain that he embraced the principles of the Reformation and married, retaining his hold upon the monastic possessions.

No trace remains of Abbot Reid's noble buildings or of any of the monastic offices of Beauly Priory. The church, enlarged and beautified by him, is now roofless and crowded with tombstones and monuments to the dead. The church was long and narrow, without aisles; it measured, after Abbot Reid's improvements, about 136 feet long and 21 feet wide. Two small chapels, added to the primitive building, gave it an irregular cruciform shape; these

chapels were dedicated to the Holy Cross and St. Catharine respectively. The former became the burial place of the Mackenzies of Kintail; the first member of that family was laid there in 1491, having married a daughter of the house of Lovat. The chapel of St. Catharine, on the south side, was the burial place of the Frasers, who succeeded the Bysets as Lords of Lovat. Another chapel, dedicated to the Holy Ghost, stood on the north side of the nave; it is thought to have been built by Hugh Fraser, of Lovat, in the early part of the fifteenth century.

The Commendator made over the priory to the Lovat family after the Reformation; Lord Simon in 1592 was confirmed in the possession. The few surviving monks had been pensioned for life by the family in 1576.

When Cromwell built his fort at Inverness, 1652-7, he carted off much of his building materials from the Priory of Beauly. Further dilapidations were caused by similar quarrying on the part of residents in the neighborhood, and hence the present ruined state of the remains. In 1815 a subscription was set on foot to prevent the entire demolition of the church, which had fallen into a disgraceful state of decay. Later on an attempt was made by the Lovat family to bring about a more complete restoration, with the view of fitting the church for Catholic worship again. But opposition was roused, and the idea was abandoned beyond the putting into a decent state of the slender remains.

The third house of Valliscaulians in Scotland was situated at Pluscardyn (or Pluscarden), in Morayshire, about six miles from Elgin. Its founder was Alexander II. Contrary to ordinary usage, which was followed in both the other Scottish houses, this priory was dedicated to St. Andrew, as its conventual seal testifies. The reason seems to have been that the valley in which it stood had long been known as St. Andrew's Vale—probably from a more ancient church there. Some are of opinion that St. Andrew was an additional titular to Our Lady and St. John Baptist.

The royal founder was very generous in his endowments to the priory, so that it became in course of time, considering its size, very wealthy. Alexander was particularly fond of Elgin as a residence; the fact not only brought the little city into prominence, but tended to keep up the King's interest in Pluscardyn and its inmates. After his death in 1249 no succeeding monarch was so liberal to the monastery, thought gifts were frequently bestowed during the ages that followed by various benefactors. From King Robert the Bruce the monks obtained the privilege of fishing in the River Spey.

Though utterly different in character from each, the scenery

around Pluscardyn could claim as great a right to be esteemed beautiful as that in which the other two houses were situated. The priory stood upon a slightly raised eminence in the centre of a fertile valley which was backed up by well-wooded hills and watered by a clear stream. From the remains of its buildings, which are considerable, it is evident that it must have been both extensive and handsome. The church was never completed beyond the choir and transepts; for there are but the bases of the pillars marking a contemplated nave. The choir measured 56 feet in length by 21 feet in breadth, and had no aisles. The transepts—about 100 feet in entire length—had eastern aisles, each of them containing two bays for altars. From the south transept a flight of stone steps led up to the dormitory of the monks, on the upper floor of the adjoining monastery. Opening from the same south transept was a chapel dedicated to our Lady.

The monastic buildings stood round a cloister garth, 100 feet square. Nearest the church was the chapter house, 28 feet square, its vaulted roof supported by a central pillar. Further on towards the south was the calefactory, or common room of the community. It contained a large, wide fireplace, for it was the only room containing a fire at which the brethren might warm themselves. Many are the regulations of the "Ordinale" concerning the use of this fire in the Valliscaulian houses. The calefactory at Pluscardyn was a noble room with a vaulted stone roof resting upon two pillars which divided it into two portions like aisles. Over these buildings ran the monks' dormitory and a small private chapel for the use of the prior. On the south side of the square was the refectory, and the kitchen was near it. The prior's lodge seems to have stood towards the southeast of the other buildings.

When Edward I. of England was bent upon obtaining superiority in Scotland, during the disputes as to the rightful sovereign, he advanced as far north as Kinloss Abbey, where he took up his quarters for ten days in the autumn of 1303. During that time both Elgin and Pluscardyn suffered much from the depredations of his soldiers. Another English monarch, Edward III., visited the same abbey in 1336, finding there a store of wine, ale, salt, fish, corn and other provisions, by means of which his men were "refreshed and not a little consoled;" the consolation, however, was not enough to restrain them from burning the town of Forres and laying waste the surrounding country! It is scarcely possible that Pluscardyn, lying but a few miles east of Forres, could have escaped their depredations.

In 1454 an event occurred of much significance to the priory. At Urquhart—or Urchard, as it was then styled—a few miles be-

yond Elgin—a Benedictine priory, dependent upon the Abbey of Dunfermline, had existed since 1125, when David I. had founded it. By the middle of the fifteenth century the Urquhart monks had dwindled to two only, and the Pluscardyn monks numbered but six. Overtures were accordingly made for the union of the two houses; the reasons given were the exceedingly small number of inmates in each and the reduced condition of revenues of both houses, which rendered it difficult to maintain them efficiently unless combined. Pope Nicholas V. accordingly decreed that the Pluscardyn monks should adopt the rule and habit of the Black Benedictines, and that the two communities should be united in the Pluscardyn house, which should become a dependency of Dunfermline.

A statement has been passed from pen to pen by many Protestant writers to the effect that the union was the consequence of the irregular lives of the Valliscaulians of Pluscardyn, who "had become very licentious and had given themselves up to gross immoralities."[6] The charge is refuted with much warmth by Mr. Macphail, a Presbyterian minister, who, greatly to his credit, has sifted the matter diligently and declares that there is no foundation for the calumny. Pope Nicholas does not refer to such a charge in his Bull; indeed, common sense would suggest that the advent of two monks from Urquhart would surely be unavailing to reform the six "very licentious" Valliscaulians.

The union tended to the increase of the community at Pluscardyn, for in 1524 the monks numbered thirteen. There were six Benedictine priors in all. The last was Alexander Dunbar, who added to the church the chapel opening from the north transept known as the "Dunbar vestry."

At the Reformation the property was acquired by Alexander Seton, afterwards Earl of Dunfermline; he was presented with the priory as a baptismal gift—after the deplorable custom of the times—by his godmother, Queen Mary. Though destined for the priesthood, he was never ordained, but, becoming learned in law, filled many high offices of state under James VI., with whom he was a great favorite. He never relinquished the Catholic faith, although he outwardly conformed to Presbyterianism in a most reprehensible way. Before his death, however, he publicly declared his Catholicism and lamented his dissimulation. Under the protection of so powerful a man, the monks remained undisturbed at the Reformation and inhabited their cloister until removed by death. In 1586 there was still one left.

In 1595 the property was bought by the Mackenzies of Kintail;

[6] Young, "Annals of Elgin" (1879).

later on it passed into the family of the Duke of Fife. A few years before his death the late Marquess of Bute bought Pluscardyn and placed the ruins and their surroundings in perfect order.

Of the three houses of the Scottish Valliscaulians this is by far the most interesting, on account of its extensive remains. The visitor cannot fail to be charmed with a place so beautiful in its decay. The picturesque ruins are chiefly early English and decorated in style; they stand amid a wealth of greenery—some of the splendid holly trees on the lawn evidently dating from monastic days.

The walls of the old church tower are nearly complete, although, like the body of the building, it is roofless. Round the interior of the church are still to be seen some of the consecration crosses. On the north side of the altar is one of the stone sacrament houses peculiar to this part of Scotland. It is really a tabernacle in the wall for the reservation of the Sacred Species. Over the space left for the door are angels carved in the stone, bearing a monstrance. Though less artistic than some other instances in the neighborhood—Cullen and Deskford, in Banffshire, for example—the Pluscardyn tabernacle is very interesting. Antiquarians have puzzled themselves in striving to ascertain the reason of these stone receptacles, as the usual method of reservation was in a pyx suspended over the high altar. It has been conjectured that the stone tabernacle was either for security during the night or for the convenience of the sick—since the Blessed Sacrament might be taken from it at any time without disturbing the monks in choir. At Pluscardyn, however, the latter reason would scarcely hold good, as it would have been necessary to pass through the choir to get to the tabernacle.

Under the arch which forms the entrance to the choir from the transept may still be discerned traces of an ancient fresco. Nothing can be seen now except a blue heaven with golden stars and the lines of a red robe; but a visitor of the eighteenth century, when the picture was probably more distinct, has described it as St. John the Evangelist writing his Gospel. Traces of painting may be seen in other parts of the church also. It seems probable that the skilled painter, Andrew Bairhum, employed by Abbot Reid in the decoration of the abbey church of Kinloss, may have exercised his talents in the neighboring priory.

When the writer visited Pluscardyn on three several occasions the calefactory was fitted up with pews and pulpit for use as a temporary place of worship for Presbyterians; the dormitory was then in use for tenants' dances. But with the advent of a Catholic proprietor such abominations have been swept away.

Not the least of the charms of this interesting place is the secluded monastery garden. Many of the ancient walnut and other trees which supplied the monks with fruit are still flourishing. In recesses of the high wall beehives once stood. The quiet of the place, far removed from any dwelling, except that of the custodian at the lodge near the entrance gate, seems to breathe still of monastic peace and rest. It is a fair specimen of many like havens of calm which were to be found in Catholic Scotland. May they spring up again and multiply apace!

MICHAEL BARRETT, O. S. B.

Fort Augustus, Scotland.

REGINALD POLE, PRINCE OF THE CHURCH.[1]

II.

NO MORE convincing evidence of the Papal approval of the work done by the commission to which had been entrusted the task of making arrangements for the assembling and general conduct of the proceedings of the General Council is needed than the fact that Paul III. selected three of its members for elevation to the Sacred College. These were Pole, Caraffa and Sadoleto. As M. Haile recalls after daily conferences, under Contarini's presidency, held in his own palace, the result was presented to the Pope in the spring of 1537 in the shape of a report entitled "Consilium de Emendanda Ecclesia," drawn up by Pole, and signed by all the members of the commission: Cardinals Contarini, Caraffa, Sadoleto and Pole, the Archbishops of Salerno and Brindisi, the Bishop of Verona, the abbot of San Giorgio Maggiore, Venice, and "Frater" Thomas, Master of the Sacred Palace. The ecclesiastics named were all men of the highest personal character, well known to deplore the existence of the gross abuses in the management of the concerns of the Church which had come into existence in many countries owing to the baleful influence exercised by secular princes who had sought to reduce it to the level of a mere appanage of the State.[2] The report of the commission was a tremendously

[1] "Life of Reginald Pole," by Martin Haile, second edition. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, 1911.

[2] In a note Mr. Haile remarks that: "It is repeatedly said that the Popes of that period were averse to reform, fearing its effect upon the Roman Court; but the publication now in process of the Pontifical registers is a solemn refutation of the accusation. The Constitution "De Reformatione Curiæ" of the 13th December, 1513 (Hergenröther, Regista Leone X., No. 1,736), alone suffices to prove how seriously Pope Leo X. desired the reform of the Court of Rome."—G. B. Pighi: G. M. Giberti, Vescovo di Verona," Verona, 1900.

outspoken document and attested in the clearest fashion how far its authors were from being mere courtiers or sycophants. The document still exists to prove this fact. It pointed out, first of all, the measureless exaltation of the Papal power by servile counsellors, who had sought to prove, on unstable grounds, that the Pope is the possessor, and not merely the custodian of all benefices. The Vicar of Christ ought not to use the power of the keys committed to him by God for purposes of gain, and it is incumbent upon him to take care that his lieutenants—Bishops and priests—should be worthy of their office. Numberless evils flow from the great carelessness with which sacred offices are bestowed—the contempt of the spiritual state, the neglect of the worship of God. After all the abuses, down to the neglected and dirty appearance of some of the officiating clergy in St. Peter's, have been enumerated, with a directness of language which reminds us that the commission had employed the pen of the writer of the "De Unitate," the report ended with the confident hope that under Paul III.'s pontificate God's Church would emerge cleansed and beautiful as a dove to the perpetual honor of his name. Lastly, the report addressed a personal appeal to His Holiness in the following impressive words: "Thou hast taken the name of Paul; thou wilt, we trust, follow the example of St. Paul. He was chosen to carry the name of Christ to the heathen; thou, we hope, are chosen to make that almost forgotten name live again in the hearts and works of the heathen and of us churchmen; to heal our disorders, to bring back the sheep to the fold and to turn away the anger of God, which we have deserved, from our heads."

Naturally enough, there were to be found some, even in Rome itself and in high positions at the Papal court, who had small sympathy with the recommendations contained in the report, and Mr. Haile records that many earnest and well-meaning Cardinals, whose spokesman was the Archbishop of Capua, Nicholas of Schomberg, a Dominican of rare merit, who had been raised to the purple by Leo X., were convinced that the moment was not opportune; they represented to the Pope that the reform was a measure of such high importance that it should be undertaken by the concurrent authority of all the national churches, rather than by the Papal authority alone, and advised a delay, until it could be referred to a general council. To this Cardinal Caraffa replied, urging the immediate necessity of the work, which could not be deferred under pain of mortal sin; where the path of duty was plain, it would be wrong to hesitate through fear of possible evil consequences. The truth of the last statement was abundantly proved by the fact that the "Consilium" fell at once into the hands of the Protestants;

and was repeatedly published by them as a proof, in the words of the Lutheran, Sturmius, addressed to the commissioners—"that we did not dissent from you without great and just causes." It is probable that Cardinal Pole had left Rome when the "Consilium" was presented to Paul III., although Bellarmin's assertion, that it was not handed to him until after Pole's return from the English legation, is disproved by the fact that Cardinal Schomberg, the chief opponent to the promulgation of a Bull embodying the suggestions of the commission, died in the following September, several weeks before Pole's return to Rome. Simultaneously with the dispatch of Pole to England, to endeavor to win back Henry VIII. to his allegiance to the Church, the Pope had sent John Anthony, Count Campeggio, to Scotland as the bearer to the reigning sovereign of that realm, James V., announcing that he had sent Pole as Legate "to the people of England." The distinction implied will be noted. Henry had forfeited all personal right to be longer regarded as a Catholic monarch in union with the Holy See. Count Campeggio was the bearer to the Scotch king of a valuable sword and hat, which, according to the custom of the time, the Pope had blessed on Christmas night. Pole's instructions seem to have required him to exhaust all the resources of argument and solicitation with Henry before promulgating against him in his own dominions the Papal censures of which he was the bearer, and these instructions would no doubt have been faithfully observed by the Cardinal had it been possible to fulfill his mission. This, however, was precisely what he was not permitted to do. At the moment when Pole accepted the mission entrusted to him the whole of the north of England had risen in arms against Henry, demanding the restoration of the ancient religion of the realm. The insurrection was, however, mercilessly suppressed by the King's forces, under the command of the Duke of Norfolk. This suppression was effected by means of almost incredible barbarities. Moreover, not only the Emperor of Germany, Francis I., but the King of France desired for reasons of state to remain on terms of alliance with England, and consequently refused wherever they could to afford facilities for traveling through their dominions to the Papal Legate. The French monarch was even guilty of the unparalleled discourtesy of refusing audience to the Cardinal, and eventually the latter had to abandon his task as hopeless. The seeds were being laid already of that faithlessness to Catholic duty which was to eventuate in the bloodshed and impieties of 1792 and the Reign of Terror. It must not, however, be forgotten that the foreign as well as the domestic policy was almost demoniacally astute. He first persuaded his rebellious subjects that he would alleviate their grievances, and

actually granted them formal pardon of their legal treason, but this was only preliminary to their execution. Abroad he kept both the Emperor of Germany and the King of France in continual fear that, if either cast in his lot with the Pope, all the power of England would be ranked on the side of the other. The situation both at home and on the Continent is well described by Mr. Haile when he says that although Lord Darcy and Robert Aske, after the King's pardon, had been mainly instrumental in putting down Sir Francis Bigod's rebellion, they were treated as he was. Lord Hussey, who, in former days with Darcy, had sought through Chapuys to induce Charles V. to come to the assistance of Katherine of Arragon and the Church in England,was tried, with his old friend, at Westminster on the 15th of May and executed on Tower Hill on the 30th of June. To these must be added Sir Robert Constable, Sir Thomas Piercey, Sir Stephen Hambleton, Sir John Bulmer, George Lumley, Nicholas Tempest, William Thurst, abbot of Fountains, Adam Sudbury, abbot of Gervaux, the abbot of Rivers, William Wold, and several others of lower rank. Most of them in vain produced their certificates of free pardon and proved conclusively that since their submission at Pontefract they had taken no part in any new movement against the King's authority. One woman was comprehended in the slaughter—Lady Bulmer, "a very fayre creature and a beautiful," was burned at the stake at Smithfield. By such means did Henry VIII. bring to subjection the independent men of the North, reducing them to the cowed and humbled state of the commons of the South, of the nobility and of the servile clergy who registered the acts of his spiritual authority.[3] It was not solely by the weight of his overmastering tyranny that he gained his ends, but by a combination of ferocity with statesmanship as able as it was unscrupulous. In his foreign policy he was equally successful. The height to which the genius of Wolsey had raised the power of England Henry had been clever enough to maintain—

[3] Mr. Haile points out that with regard to the answer made by Henry VIII. to the just and reasonable demands of the men of the north, Dr. Gairdner remarks: "In such a case he was his own prime minister. The Duke of Norfolk wrote to Darcey that the King had taken very great pains with the reply, writing it out with his own hand, and making no creature privy thereto till it was finished. The answer he made was that of a skilled tactician. Some of the complaints, he said were so general that it was difficult to meet them, but as to the faith, if it was the faith of Christ and the Church, if it was the Church of England, he had done no injury to either. All that he had done was according to law and for the benefit of his subjects. As to councillors of noble birth, how came they to think that there were more at the beginning of his reign than now? There was no foundation for such an opinion. In any case it did not become subjects to appoint a council for their King but if they could prove the disloyalty of any of his present council he would proceed against them."—Vol. XI., Preface, p. xxxviii.

a task facilitated by the almost chronic state of war between the empire and France—to each of whom it was easy to hold out hopes of coöperation, thus keeping both eager to stand well with him; and his daughter's hand was still, as it had been since her birth, the chief counter in his game of politics, which amply explains why that hand, so often tendered, was never bestowed. At this moment he was negotiating with the Emperor for Mary's marriage with Don Luis, of Portugal, Charles V.'s nephew, and with Francis I. for a match with the Duke of Orleans. Mary was illegitimate by Act of Parliament, but since Rome's decision in favor of her mother, Europe disregarded that, and it was an understood thing that her marriage would be preceded by another Act reversing the first. This fully explains what followed in the course of Cardinal Pole's legation.[4] The Papal Bull appointing Pole as Legate enjoined him to do all within his power to induce Henry to abandon his evil proceedings, but it also directed him, in the event of his failing to secure this result by peaceable methods, to encourage the people of England to resort to insurrectionary methods in order to bring His Majesty to a right way of thinking. It is by no means improbable that the King knew all about Pole's instructions, for he had his spies even in Rome. That he would soon have discovered them, had the Cardinal been allowed to land within his dominions, may be taken for granted, as well as that His Eminence would speedily have been executed unless—like some other of Henry's victims—he "died of joy" in the Tower on discovering how great was the clemency and goodness of that murderous and adulterous miscreant. Under all the circumstances and considering the methods and manners of the time, it is perhaps scarcely to be wondered at that Henry undoubtedly employed a number of bravoes to find opportunities to assassinate the Pope's envoy or to kidnap him and bring him prisoner to England. This policy, however, proved as futile as did that which Pole was engaged in carrying into effect. It is deplorable to be compelled to note that Henry's chief agent in making arrangements for the assassination or capture of the Cardinal was Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, who later on, when religion was restored under Queen Mary, returned to his allegiance to the Holy See and eventually died deploring the crimes of which he had been guilty through sheer sycophancy and self-seeking in the days of her tyrannous father. On this point Mr. Haile says that Henry could ill brook a partial success; it was not enough to have compelled the King of France and the Regent of the Netherlands to the hitherto unheard-of step of refusing audience to a Papal Legate; so long as Reginald Pole was alive and free, the King could

[4] Haile's "Life of Reginald Pole," pp. 203-204.

not live content, and any means were good to attain his ends. A letter to Gardiner and Brian, dated Greenwich, 25th of April, makes his purpose plain, and also shows how he used personal apprehension as a fulcrum for moving his servitors to his will; for he begins with the ominous reminder that Gardiner has not yet purged himself from the charge of saying that Henry would be content if Pole were driven out of France. He must now, therefore, suggest to Francis I. (telling him, however, that he has no command to do so) that as Pole is at Cambray, a place which, though neutral, France has a certain interest in, and which is not far from the English marches, he should do what he can to get Pole expelled from it—

"And for as much as we would be very glad to have the said Pole by some means trussed up and conveyed to Calais, we desire and pray you to consult and devise between you thereupon."

If they think it feasible, Brian shall secretly appoint fellows for the purpose.[5]

The thing was soon planned, and Sir Thomas Palmer, porter of Calais, wrote to Cromwell, apparently on the 6th of May, that he would start next day for Flanders, on the pretense of buying a horse, and would get half a dozen persons to meet him at Gravelines. His real object may be divined from a subsequent letter to Lord Lisle, Deputy of Calais, in which he writes:

"The man you wot of doth not come out of his lodging, nor intends not, as I can learn; for I take the French King too much to be his friend, which I trust he will repent at length."[6]

This failure is alluded to in a letter from Cromwell to Gardiner and Brian, dated Hampton Court, 18th of May, telling them the King is not inclined to advance money for Pole's apprehension, seeing that the matter has got wind, and Pole is warned to look after himself; but if they can induce those to whom they have already broached the matter to do it for some reward in case of success, the King will make good their promise. God's Providence, however, marvelously protected the illustrious Legate, and eventually, after many hairbreadth escapes from the designs of his enemies, he reached Rome, where, on Friday, October 18, 1537, he was received in public consistory by the Pontiff, and gave the assembled Cardinals an account of his mission as well as of the methods by which its purpose had been defeated. His Eminence was, however, never long idle and promptly reëngaged in his previous work of assisting in making the arrangements necessary for the holding of the general council. Our present purpose, however, is not to deal with the history of the Council of Trent, the enactments of

[5] Add. MS., 25, 114, f. 262.

[6] Gairdner. Vol. XII., Part I., Preface, p. xxxix.

which form the major portion of what may be styled the existing statute law of the Church.

Meantime things were going from bad to worse in England, and as Mr. Haile recalls, relative to 1538, the ferocity of the King's proceedings increased with the progress of the year, beginning with the burning of Friar Forrest, the Franciscan who had been Queen Katherine's confessor, for declining to relinquish his habit without the Pope's permission; while, to show his orthodoxy, Henry had two German Anabaptists burned for heresy. Thomas Miller, Lancaster Herald, was put to death at York in August for having bowed the knee to Robert Aske and endeavored to pacify the rebels, for which imaginary crime he was tried a year and a half after it had been committed. With him suffered Henry Litherland, vicar of Newark, and Robert Moreby, a monk of Fountain's Abbey, with sixteen smaller offenders. The events of September included the solemn farce of the trial and burning of the bones of St. Thomas of Canterbury, the citation of a man who had lain two hundred and fifty years in his tomb, to appear in court and answer to a charge of treason; the court seated solemnly at Westminster, after the thirty days—allowed by canon law—had been suffered to elapse, and, as the saint did not put in an appearance, judgment would have been given against him in default, had not the King of his special grace assigned to him a counsel. When the Attorney General and the advocate of the accused—with what feelings we may be allowed to wonder—had made their speeches, Thomas, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury, was pronounced guilty of rebellion, contumacy and treason, his bones to be publicly burned, the offerings which had been made at his shrine, and accumulated treasure of enormous value, adjudged the personal property of the reputed saint—and here we find the key to proceedings which might appear the result of pure dementia—forfeited to the crown.[7] All this time Henry, with the assistance of foresworn and opportunist prelates of the stamp of the Bishop of Winchester, was publishing treatises in defense of his own pretensions and generally posing as a true defender of the original faith of the Church, while he was engaged in constant intrigues on the Continent to make the council as abortive as he had succeeded in rendering Pole's mission. Referring to this terrible period, Mr. Haile further says that by the end of the year Henry VIII. appears to have reached that stage in a tyrant's career when the sentiment of fear lends its own sinister color to his crimes,

[7] In November Henry exercised in person the judicial function attached to his supremacy by presiding, clad in white silk, at the trial of Lambert, a London schoolmaster. When the prisoner threw himself on his Majesty's mercy: "Then," said the King, "thou must die, for I will not be the patron of heretics."

the rampart of heads never appears high enough, the stream of blood wide enough to ensure security, and he strikes again and again, and still in vain; for the phantoms and fearful shapes moving in the plain beyond loom all the more threateningly, strike how he may. In December the King aimed an appalling blow at the most illustrious heads in the kingdom, sending his nearest kinsmen to the scaffold on charges as flimsy as those upon which Buckingham had been sent to his doom twenty years before.[8]

Once more, however, we must remind our readers that our business in this article is not so much with events of this kind as with the actual facts connected with the career of Reginald Pole. We may, at the same time, fairly urge that to arrive at a proper understanding of the actions and policy of that glorious servant of the Church, it is absolutely necessary to have something like correct acquaintance with the problems by which he was confronted. England—the England which he loved so dearly and for the saving of which from the blighting effects of heresy he would willingly have sacrificed his life—was in a state approaching chaos, so far as the interests of religion were concerned. His own elder brother, Henry, Lord Montague, and his younger, Sir Geoffrey Pole, were among the latest victims of Henry's barbarity. Both were tried and sentenced to death, but only Montague was executed. Reginald—a weak-minded, weak-kneed creature—was pardoned after having, in a paroxysm of terror, tried to commit suicide by stifling himself with a cushion. Both for the saving of their lives and possessions had been facile sycophants of the bloodthirsty King, and their only offense was that they were brothers of the fearless Cardinal. Pole so far had only received the tonsure, but on the 21st or 22d of November, 1538, the Pope conferred on him the four minor orders.

Very soon after this, on the 27th of December, Pole was dispatched by the Pope on a new mission, the object of which was to endeavor to secure the full coöperation of the Emperor Charles V. and the King of France in carrying into execution the great and statesmanlike plan he had formed for bringing to an end the appalling career of sin and criminality which Henry was pursuing. As Mr. Haile tells the story, in his instructions to Pole, the Pope orders him to urge the Emperor, on account of the impiety and ferocity of the King of England, to undertake the reduction of his realm

[8] "If any one living in happier times be disposed to wonder at all this injustice and how it could safely have been perpetrated on prominent men in a high-spirited nation like the English, he must remember that the merits of the case were not at all clearly or fully set before the public. The mode of trial always bore hard upon the accused, and if the people at large suspected, as they did, that all was not perfectly equitable matters of State were not theirs to pry into. They could only compassionate in silence the victims of oppression."—Gairdner, Vol. XIII. Part II., Preface.

to the true religion, and no longer to suffer that King to rage with impunity against God and His saints. The Pope had prepared a new Bull, and published it in Rome, renewing the execution of the Bull of 30th of August, 1535, which had been suspended in hope of Henry's amendment; and in the confederacy he and Pole were anxious to bring about, resort to arms would in all probability have been unnecessary. All that was wanted was to treat as outside civilization a tyrant who had shown himself utterly regardless of all human ties and of all religious sanctions. Had England been effectually isolated in the way Paul III. intended, and as Pole was directed to press upon the Emperor, by the prohibition of all commerce, Henry's subjects would have been unable to endure the situation, and Henry himself would have been compelled to make peace with the Church and atone for past transgressions as the only condition for retaining the throne. If the two leading princes of Christendom could have agreed in this line of action, England would have had a very uncomfortable neighbor north of the Tweed, and Henry would have found himself, like his predecessor, King John, compelled by a Papal interdict and a foreign invasion, aided by his own subjects, to rule over the latter more like a Christian prince. It is noteworthy that, nearly three centuries later, Napoleon in his plan of campaign against England largely adopted Pope Paul's policy of organizing a Continental boycott of English commerce.

The terrible tragedy of the reign of Henry VIII., followed by the sacrilegious comedy of that of Edward VI., both came to an end at last, and on the 1st of October, 1553, Queen Mary was duly crowned as sovereign of England, France and Ireland—a ceremonial formula long continued by successive rulers of England, the word "France" being first omitted in the case of George III. We are told by Mr. Haile that next day Ferrario reported to Duke Ercole that a description of the magnificent ceremonies would need a volume, but he gives us one interesting detail: "The Queen went in one carriage, the most serene Elizabeth in another, with the Duchess of Cleves, in former times Queen"—*altre volte regina.* Elizabeth carried the crown in the Abbey, and the French Ambassador Noailles' whispered reply to her whispered remark—" 'Tis mighty heavy" —"It will feel much lighter on your own head," can hardly have referred to the order of natural succession to a monarch of thirty-seven years of age.

In his letter Ferrario continues: "Every one speaks most honorably of Cardinal Pole, and were it to please him to return to his native country, there can be no doubt that he would be welcomed, honored and respected, *'osservato'*—as he deserves."

The suggestion was entirely in accordance with Pole's own desires, because he felt that what the new Catholic ruler of England needed most of all was a counsellor of English birth, whose patriotism was as unimpeachable as he knew his was. Grave danger existed that the people might be persuaded that Mary was merely a puppet inspired by foreign princes, while the past proceedings of the only capable politician among her advisers—Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester—left grave room for doubt as to his orthodoxy in purely spiritual matters and no room at all for doubt as to his attitude concerning the supremacy of the Vicar of Christ in the government of the Church. Accordingly, he wrote to the Queen, telling her that he is moved to do so by the Emperer's letters to him, through the Bishop of Arras, recommending delay and urging the postponement of his legation to a more suitable time. The arguments are those of a prudent prince, but Pole, calling to mind the great benefits God has bestowed upon Mary, thinks that she may accept the guidance of the Divine light in matters of religion rather than that of human prudence. After a touching allusion to Mary's steadfastness and to all she had suffered for her faith, now that that stormy time is past, should not the light which formerly burned dimly in a lantern be placed *super candelabrum, ut luceat omnibus?*[9] It would be to the Queen's dishonor if she were to turn back, lamp in hand, as if it lacked oil, and instead of trusting to the light hitherto fed by the oil furnished by her Lord and spouse, she were to seek that which is sold in the shops of human prudence. Pole advises her rather to encourage the Emperor by her example on that point, on which he has not the heart to encourage her, and he begs her to try and tranquillize Charles V. on the subject before Pole's arrival at his court as Legate, now appointed to him and to the King of France to negotiate peace between their Majesties. Having thus announced his new legation, the Cardinal touches upon the question of those who fear the loss of their property. Human prudence will devise means to remove similar obstacles, and the Pope is so much inclined to gratify the Queen and the kingdom that nothing could be demanded for her own consolation and the benefit of the realm which His Holiness is not ready to grant. Mary's reply to the Cardinal—not quite improbably dictated or inspired by Gardiner—was somewhat non-committal. It made no reference to Pole's contemplated mission to her realm, but expressed a fervent hope that Parliament might repeal its monstrous statutes subversive of the old religion and that she might be enabled to give

[9] "No man when he hath lighted a candle placeth it under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that it may give light to all who are in the house."—St. Mark iv., 21; St. Luke xi., 33.

full effect to her own desire to safeguard the interests of the Church. The Cardinal had already sent to London his own faithful chamberlain, Henry Penning, who was in close communication with the worried and almost distracted Queen, and he sent Pole a long account of how matters were proceeding. He told that Mary had been in great fear that her coronation, according to the ancient rite, would produce serious disturbances. No turmoil, however, had arisen, but, on the contrary, the new sovereign had been received with enthusiastic acclamations as she passed through the streets of her capital. Moreover, Gardiner had acted extremely well at the opening of Parliament on the 5th of October, and delivered "a very firm speech," in which he dealt amply with the need for the maintenance of the unity of religion and the immediate repeal of the obnoxious laws. In the course of this address the Bishop of Winchester frankly avowed his own heinous faults, his deep repentance therefor and his hope that the representatives of the nation would be as eager as he was for the securing of a great act of national reparation. Penning went on to tell how:

"On the following Saturday—October 7—Her Majesty informed me that things had gone well; she had found many of the chief personages of the realm ready to encourage her to promote the affairs of religion and reunion, whilst others were of opinion that she had greater need of the curb than the spur.

"Her Majesty did not impart her negotiations with me to any of the Lords of the Council, nor to any one else, having previously ordered me to conceal myself, which I did. Her Majesty's final decision, at my dispatch, was that his Right Reverend Lordship was to come slowly—*'pian, piano'*—towards Brussels, where he would hear what more could be hoped about his proceeding further. . . . Her Majesty gave me a copy of the oath taken by her at her coronation, which she had thoroughly considered beforehand, and had added a few words to it, having for object to maintain Her Majesty's integrity and good will, as may be seen by the identical copy.

"Her Majesty also told me that she had given command for the Knights of [the Garter] to hold a chapter for the reëstablishment of all the ceremonies relating to the honor and dignity of that order, which consist in the saying of certain Masses, etc. Her Majesty also showed me the holy oil which she had sent to obtain at Brussels from the Emperor."

There were, however, many difficulties still to be surmounted. The House of Lords were, as they have generally been, amenable to the will of the sovereign, but the House of Commons was more difficult to manage. Mr. Haile says that if by detaining Penning

Mary hoped to be able to send word of the passage of the comprehensive bill, framed to repeal at once all the acts affecting either her parents' marriage or the exercise of religion, she was disappointed. The Peers made no objection, but in the Commons an opposition was being organized which alarmed the Ministers, and the Queen prorogued Parliament for three days, during which interval two separate bills were prepared, the first dealing with the marriage of Henry VIII. and Katherine of Arragon, in which all mention of a Papal dispensation was dexterously avoided, and which passed without a voice being raised against it in either house, though it was equivalent to a statute of bastardy against Elizabeth. The second bill, avoiding all reference to the ecclesiastical supremacy of the crown or the alienation of Church property, professed to have no other object than to restore religion to that state in which Edward had found it on his accession. The opposition was confined to the lower house, the debate on the second reading lasting two days; but though the friends of the new doctrines are said to have amounted to one-third of the members, the bill passed, apparently without a division. Thus at one stroke disappeared the whole fabric of the "new religion" as established by law, while the old liturgy was restored throughout the realm. That the ancient basis of unquestioning faith had, however, been seriously disturbed was later on to become only too clearly apparent. No country can have its national creed made and remade by Act of Parliament without difficulties arising. Many of those who voted for the restoration of Catholicity under Mary had been equally ready to vote for its destruction under Edward VI. These same personages—as events proved—were equally ready to again vote for its subversion when Elizabeth ascended the throne. The curse of the time was an all-pervading opportunism. Men were thinking much more of their material possessions and how to retain them than of God or eternity. Protestantism, which then, as now, was merely a compromise between pagan materialism and Catholicity, had largely paralyzed the conscience of the nation.

At this crucial moment a new complexity arose. A number of foreign princes were known to aspire to a matrimonial alliance with the Queen, but Parliament and the people in general were at least equally anxious that her husband should be an Englishman. Under Gardiner's influence the House of Commons adopted an address to this effect. The idea seems to have found popular acceptance that the Pope might be prevailed on to grant Pole such dispensation as would enable him to become the future King Consort. While this question was being discussed, however, Mary had made up her own mind. She was determined that Philip of Spain

should be her husband. No choice less in accordance with the prevailing national sentiment could possibly have been imagined, but, as Mr. Hailes states, the very night after the voting in the Commons and after saying she would prove a match for the cunning of the Chancellor—Gardiner—she sent for Renard, the Imperial Ambassador, bade him follow her to her private oratory, and there, kneeling before the altar, she recited the hymn "Veni Creator Spiritus," and then called God to witness that she pledged her faith to Philip, prince of Spain, and while she lived would never take any other man for her husband. This rash and uncalled-for promise was kept a profound secret, though the subsequent language of the Queen proved to the courtiers that she had taken her final resolution. Needless to say, the belief she shared with her subjects that Reginald Pole would prove the resolute opponent of such a marriage, increased the fears carefully instilled into her by the imperial agents. There is no reason for supposing that the Cardinal was influenced by any other motives than those springing from an accurate knowledge of the prejudices of his fellow-countrymen and by realization of the intense dislike and fear of Spain which had been instilled into their minds. Mary, however, was resolute, and she wrote several letters to Pole, in which she sought to dissuade him from pursuing his embassy to England, on the ground that his presence would only add to the difficulties which already impeded the restoration of the true religion. It appears only too probable that the communications in question quite correctly described the state of the popular mind at the time, because it had been persistently poisoned by all kinds of false and malicious statements on the part of the apostles of heresy. That superstitious fear and hatred of "the Pope" which still lingers among the more ignorant sections of the English democracy and of the Protestants of the north of Ireland was a very live, very real and very general thing in the days with which we are dealing. In one of her communications to Pole the Queen—describing existing conditions—said:

"The proceedings in Parliament put this beyond a doubt, and so strangely are the minds of the people prepossessed against the Roman Pontiff that they find less difficulty in admitting all the other tenets of the Catholic religion than the single article which regards the subordination due to him. . . .

"My fears are that they will obstinately insist on my continuing to assume the headship of the Church, but I am not at a loss in what manner to reply. . . . The title in debate does not agree with kings, as the royal state, in spiritual concerns, is subordinate to the sacerdotal, and the jurisdiction of the body politic being of a different order from that of the priesthood, their power, dignity

and functions are distinct; then there is a peculiar difficulty arising from my very sex, to which nothing could be less suited than such a title and the extent of power annexed to it. . . ."

The Cardinal, however, was an Englishman, and he possessed no small share of the bulldog tenacity characteristic of his race. He was determined to fulfill his mission and he was not easily frightened, but many obstacles arose to hinder his progress, and although it would be interesting to describe these, considerations of space prevent our doing so. Mr. Haile, however, tells the story at length and in admirable fashion. Meantime the marriage of Mary to Philip of Spain had taken place with the full approval of Parliament, and the most complicated question with which Pole expected to be confronted on his arrival in England had practically been settled by the Pope before the Cardinal arrived in that country.

Mr. Haile says with reference to this matter that if the spoils of the Church in England had at first been confined to a few favorites and purchasers, during the lapse of more than twenty years they were now become, by sales and bequests, divided and sub-divided among thousands, and almost every family of opulence in the kingdom had reason to fear any measures which might induce the compulsive surrender of the whole or of part of its possessions. Pole's own opinion was that anything in the shape of a bargain on such a subject would be derogatory to the dignity and rights of the Holy See; that the return to obedience should be made unconditionally, and the rest left to the clemency of the Pope. But this view did not prevail at Rome, and Julius III. sent him, through Morone, on the 7th of November, a Bull, at the sight of which, Morone hopes, all his scruples will cease. The Emperor and the King and Queen of England, he continues, had sent Don Juan Manrique in all haste to Rome, to express their opinion on the subject, that no less could be done than give the ecclesiastical property to those who hold it:

"This appears necessary, owing to the great number of persons interested, many of whom have received these estates *ex causa onerosa,* or for services rendered to the sovereign, any inquiry into which would be tantamount to throwing the whole island into confusion. . . . The essential thing is to bring the people back to the unity of the Church and to promote the salvation of so many souls, and for the rest it appears that it is permissible to *give* that which may not be *sold.*

"Your Lordship need therefore have no scruples about the matter; in fact, the opinion of the theologians and legists has been taken in congregation, and it was agreed that if it is lawful to alienate the goods of the Church for the redemption of captives, it were

even more so to redeem a kingdom and for the welfare of so many souls."

The Bull empowered the Legate to give, alienate and transfer to the present possessors all property, movable or immovable, which had been torn from the Church during the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI.[10] A description of the personal appearance and habit of life at this time of the Queen, from the pen of the Venetian Ambassador, quoted by Mr. Haile, is worth reproducing: The Ambassador wrote as follows:

"She was born on the 8th of February, 1515, so yesterday completed her thirty-eighth year and six months. She is of low stature, with a red and white complexion, and very thin; her eyes are light and large and her hair reddish; her face is round, the nose rather low and wide, and were not her age on the decline, she might be called handsome rather than the contrary. She is not of a strong constitution, and of late she suffers from headache and serious affection of the heart [*grave passione di cuore*]. . . . She is of very spare diet, and never eats till 1 or 2 P. M., although she rises at daybreak, when, after saying her prayers and hearing Mass in private, she transacts business incessantly until after midnight, when she retires to rest; for she chooses to give audience not only to all the members of her Council—and to hear from them every detail of public business—but also to all other persons who demand it of her."

The description can scarcely be held to be flattering, but it agrees in the main with several others. At the moment when these words were written the kingdom was in parlous case. Mr. Haile recalls that more than a year had in fact elapsed since Mary's accession, out of the small number of years—had she but known it—before her and before the faithful cousin who would have saved her, if he could, from the disaster of her ill-omened marriage. Every day which had elapsed since that event had made it more and more clear to the Queen that what she needed most of all was some authoritative adviser, and on the 28th of September, 1554, she wrote to Pole telling how anxiously she and her husband looked for his arrival in England as Papal Legate: "that we may be delivered from the scruples which trouble us and many persons specially attached to our service, on account of the censures pronounced against this kingdom in the times of heresy and schism."

There appears no room for doubt that, despite the many denunciations which Henry VIII. and his advisers had hurled at Pole, the Cardinal stood high in the estimation of his fellow-countrymen,

[10] The clause, "to give alienate and transfer," had been devised by Gardiner as the most likely to tranquillize the present possessors and secure them against subsequent claims.—Pallavicini, II., p. 411.

and that had he been allowed to come to the assistance of Mary immediately upon her accession to the throne and before her marriage to Philip the whole course of the history of the country might have been very different from that now recorded. Once the union referred to took place it was, of course, easy for Mary's enemies to persuade the populace that all her actions were the result of Spanish influence.

WALTER F. DESTERRE...

ARMAGH AND ITS CATHEDRAL.

THE beatification of the Venerable Oliver Plunkett, the martyred Irish Primate, to which all Ireland is looking forward eagerly, will again rivet attention on the ancient Primatial See over which he presided. The name of Armagh carries the mind back to the very dawn of ecclesiastical history in that island. The long historic perspective which it opens up to the mental vision, covering a period of fifteen centuries, is crowded with characters and events memorable in the annals of the country. At the extremity of the perspective, as the mind's eye glances backward, one discerns, environed in a halo of sanctity, the venerable figure of the great Apostle of the Irish race, and, after him, as it were in processional order, an unbroken succession of Pontiffs, several of whom were very militant churchmen who took an active part in many momentous movements. Some have been decreed the honors of the altars as canonized saints.

By its strategical position and its importance, both civil and ecclesiastical, it has been a pivotal point, a centre of offensive or defensive operations, a rampart around which has been waged many a hotly contested battle. Alternately pillaged and burned by Danes and Anglo-Normans[1] and Irish chieftains, ruthlessly ravaged by fire and sword, the old Primatial city has witnessed many sad scenes of riot and rapine. A city seated on a hill, it has long topographically and historically occupied a conspicuous position.

Founded in 445, Armagh owes its origin and ecclesiastical preëminence to St. Patrick, the Primatial See of Ireland antedating that of Canterbury by a century and a half and that of Dublin

[1] It was burned no less than sixteen times between the years 670 and 1179, and plundered nine times, mostly by Danes, during the ninth and tenth centuries.

by six centuries. The story of its foundation is idyllic. Historically authentic, it is still enveloped in that atmosphere of the legendary and romantic which invests the narrative with a certain poetic attractiveness. It has often been told and retold, but perhaps never better or more picturesquely paraphrased than by Dr. Healy, the erudite Archbishop of Tuam, in his valuable work, "Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars."[2] St. Patrick, he says, had purposed to build his church and found his Primatial See in the sweet and flowery fields of Louth, where the deep seclusion of a sheltered meadow wooed his weary heart to build a house for God and a home for his own declining years. But God had willed it otherwise. "Get thee northward," said the angel visitor, "to the height of Macha (Ard-Macha); it is there that Providence wills that you should build your church and fix your chair for ever." Promptly, though regretfully, the Apostle obeyed; and, crossing the slopes of Slieve Gullion, soon came in sight of the swelling hills of Macha of which God's angel spoke—

> So long as sea
> Girdeth this isle, so long thy name shall hang
> In splendor o'er it like the stars of God.

The place had long been famous in the legendary history of Ireland. It was the classic ground of poetry and romance. Navan fort, just one mile to the west of the present city of Armagh, was the site of the ancient and famous palace of Emania, founded three hundred years before the Christian era by Macha of the golden hair, who traced the site of the rath with the brooch of gold from her neck, and hence it was called Eamhuin, in Latin Emania, but pronounced in Irish Avan, so that with the article prefixed it becomes Navan, or "the fort of the neck-brooch," the name which it retains to the present day. Macha of the golden hair was buried on the height called from her Ard-Macha, although the spot cannot be exactly identified. To the westward of Navan fort is a townland called Creeveroe, which takes its name from the famous Red Branch Knights (Craebh-ruadh), who dwelt on that western slope of Emania, where they had a school of chivalry, in which they were trained to all martial feats of valor and were always at hand to defend their sovereign and follow him to the battlefield. When St. Patrick came to Ard-Macha, that home of chivalry was silent and deserted, for Emania had been totally destroyed by the Three Collas about the year A. D. 322, after it had flourished for more than 600 years. The old order changed, yielding place to the new, and the foundress of Emania gave her name to the royal seat of a more enduring kingdom.

---

[2] Chap. VI., pp. 110-113.

When Patrick, with his train of clerics, came to Armagh, he went straight to the local dynast, whose name was Daire—a grandson, it seems, of Eoghan, son of Niallan, who gave his name to the barony of Oneilland. Daire was a rough and bold, but not a cruel prince; he had heard, too, of Patrick and of the God of Christians; so when the saint asked him for a site for a church on the Ridge of the Willows (Druim-Saileach), although he refused him that proud site on the hill, he granted him leave to build a church in the neighboring plain to the west, which was called Na Fearta, or the church of the graves. But Daire, greedy even for what he had given to God, sent down two of his fleet coursers to graze on the green and fertile meadow which Patrick had enclosed for his church. It was very necessary to teach the rude warriors of the time that God's acre may not lawfully be profaned by man or beast, so it came to pass that when the horses tasted of the grass they both fell dead, and the King's servants brought word to their master that the Christian priest had killed them. Daire's brow grew dark, and mentally he swore that he would slay Patrick and all his people, when suddenly he sickened with a sickness nigh to death. Then in great haste the Queen, "whose lustrous violet eyes were lost in tears," sent a messenger to the saint and besought him to heal her husband, for she knew his malady was a chastisement from God. Patrick yielded to the woman's gracious prayer, and blessing water from the font, he gave it to the messengers and bade them sprinkle therewith the horses and the King. This was done, and lo! the horses came to life again and the King's sore sickness left him. Then Daire sent to Patrick as a gift a huge bronze cauldron, in those days a gift not unworthy of a king. The saint, raising his eyes from his breviary, said "Deo gratias," but no more. "How did the priest receive my gift?" said the King. "'Gratzicam,' was all he said," replied the messenger. Then the King in wrath bade them go again and bear away the gift from the ungrateful priest, and again Patrick merely said "Deo gratias." "What said he now?" asked the King. "Only 'Gratzicam,'" answered the messengers. "It is strange," said Daire; "'Gratzicam' when it is given and 'Gratzicam' when it is taken away. The word must be good. I will restore him the cauldron and give him the Ridge of the Willows, that he may build a church unto his God."

So Patrick and Daire, with his Queen, and the clerics and the warriors of Daire, ascended the slope, and on the crown of that sacred hill Patrick, book in hand, marked out the site of the church and all the buildings connected therewith and consecrated it to God for ever. Now it came to pass that as the concourse

was advancing a doe with her fawn was lying under a tree. The startled doe flew swiftly away to the north, and the King's attendants were going to kill the little fawn, but Patrick said "No," and stretching forth his hand, he took the fawn and put it on his own shoulders, and the doe, taking courage, followed him home and remained with the nuns of Na Fearta ever after, giving them milk, too, besides feeding her fawns. This lesson of love and tenderness even to the brute creation produced a great effect on the warriors of Daire. They saw how Patrick pitied the poor doe and would not hurt its offspring; they saw in him the image of that Good Shepherd of whom he spoke to them so often; and thus they were made to learn that the Gospel of Patrick was a message of love—of love for God, their great Father in heaven, and for all their fellow-men on earth.

According to the Book of Armagh, written about the year A. D. 807, the doe, with her fawn, was lying on the very "spot where the altar of the northern church of Ard-Macha now stands;" and Patrick carried the fawn on his shoulders until he laid it "on another eminence at the north side of Armagh, where, according to the statement of those who know the place, miraculous attestations are to be witnessed to this day." (Fol. 6, b. 2.) The northern church to which the reference is made—built on the very spot where the doe was lying—is generally thought to have been the Sabhall, or Barn, called also the "Ecclesia Sinistralis," because it was to the left of the great church, for persons entering the latter from the west. The great church itself, known as the "Damhliac" (Duleek), or the great stone church, occupied the site of the present Protestant cathedral; and it is an extraordinary coincidence, notes Dr. Healy, that the new Catholic cathedral, the crowning glory of modern Armagh, stands on the opposite hill to the north, dwarfing by its majestic proportions the Protestant church—and stands, it is said, on that very "eminence to the north" whither the great Apostle carried the fawn on his shoulders! The hunted doe there found rest; and there, too, that other "milk white hind," during the stormy centuries of the past, so often doomed to death, yet fated not to die, was destined to find a refuge and a home.[3]

Whether we hold with Keating and the Book of Lecan that it derives its name from Macha, Queen of Ultonia or Ulster, wife of Nemedius Nemidh or Nevy, who was buried there, or with Ussher, Ware and Harris, that it simply means the high place or field from its elevated position, Armagh is admittedly the most beautiful inland town in Ireland.

The churches and schools of Armagh were founded between the

[3] Archbishop Healy, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

years 450 and 457.[4] The original cathedral, the Damhliac Mor, or great stone church, the *summum templum,* was a plain oblong structure, with western door and eastern window. It seems to have had no steeple, but about forty feet from the northwestern angle stood the cloitech, or bell tower, an ordinary appendage of ancient monastic establishments, one of those famous round towers which have puzzled and perplexed antiquaries until they have been proved by Professor Stokes[5] to be of remote ecclesiastical and Oriental origin. There is some reason to think that there was more than one, for it is recorded that the bell towers as well as other buildings suffered from the effects of lightning in 995-6. There is no intimation in the whole body of our ecclesiastical authorities, Petrie says, that it was ever rebuilt, though it was undoubtedly often repaired and had transepts added to it in the twelfth century. It was before the high altar of Armagh Cathedral that Brian Boru stood as a victor—Emperor of Ireland as he proudly called himself—after he had annihilated the Danish kingdom of Limerick in 968, conquered the Waterford Danes, defeated their allies, the O'Donovans and Fitzpatricks, received the submission of the Kings of Leinster, Connaught and Meath, and in twenty-six years made himself supreme monarch of all Ireland; and it was on that memorable occasion he inscribed by the hand of his chaplain the words still to be read in the Book of Armagh[6] in Trinity College, Dublin. It was to Armagh he marched in 1005 from Cenel-Eoghan and laid on the great altar of the church the collar of gold.[7] In less than a decade later, after the decisive battle of Clontarf, crowning and culmination of his conquering career, which broke for ever the power of the dominant and destructive Danes, the chivalrous old King himself was laid to rest in a stone or hewn marble coffin deposited on the north side of the great church, having, when dying on the famous battlefield, bequeathed his soul to God and the intercession of St. Patrick

[4] Besides the cathedral and abbey, St. Patrick also founded the Tempeal Na Fearta, or Church of the Miracles, sometimes called Suidhe Padruic, or Patrick's Seat, and the Churches of Sabhal and St. Brigid. On the south side of the cathedral stood the Damhliac Toga, or Stone Church of the Elections.

[5] "Ireland and the Celtic Church," Lecture XII., p. 231, *et seq.*

[6] O'Curry thus translates the passage referred to in the Book of Armagh: "Saint Patrick, going up to heaven, commanded that all the fruit of his labor, as well as of baptisms as of causes, and of alms, should be carried to the apostolic city, which is called Scoticé Ardd Macha. So I have found it in the sight of Brian, Emperor of the Scots, and what I, Calvus Perennis, have written he determined for all the Kings of Maceria." In another translation the scribe is called "Mailsuthain," and we have "Cashel" instead of Maceria.

[7] It was on this occasion he confirmed, as far as in him lay, the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Armagh.

and his body to Armagh. It is recorded that the Primate, Mælmuire, and his clergy, with the sacred relics, met the remains and those of his son, Murchad, who fell on that fateful day, at the monastery of St. Columba, at Swords, and conveyed them to Armagh, where they lay in funeral state for twelve successive nights, hymns and prayers being chanted for their souls. In Armagh, too, had already rested for centuries the remains of Lupita, St. Patrick's sister, who died in 443.

St. Patrick also built at Armagh the Abbey of SS. Peter and Paul, served for many years by Canons Regular of St. Augustin, to which was annexed a school or college, which became famous throughout Europe and maintained its reputation down to the Reformation, being the oldest and one of the most celebrated of the ancient schools of Ireland,[8] dating in all probability from the very foundation of the see. Primarily a great theological seminary, it formed part of a group of ecclesiastical structures which crowned the summit of the holy hill where, surrounded by a large rath or earthern mound and the Fith-nemhedh, or Sacred Grove, religion and learning sat side by side enthroned for many centuries, in spite of much turbulence and bloodshed.[9] There taught St. Patrick and his disciple and immediate successor, St. Benignus, the reputed author of the "Leabha Na g-Ceart," or "Book of Rights," and of a non-extant life of St. Patrick and one of the compilers of the great collection of Brehon laws known as the "Senchus Mor;" Gildas the Wise, regent or rector of the school, the first historian of the Britons and a renowned preacher; Cernech, a learned priest and scribe, whose reputation also acquired for him the affix of "the Wise;" Mælbrighde, a successor of St. Patrick, described as "a vessel full of all the wisdom and knowledge of his time;" Imar O'Hagan,[10] the master of the great St. Malachy (whose father, Mugron O'More, had been "chief lector of divinity of this school and of all the west of Europe"), and who, when made Archbishop in 1126, rebuilt the great Church of SS. Peter and Paul in more than its ancient splendors and introduced into the abbey the canons regular of St. Augustin; O'Drugan, chief professor, called the

[8] Its degrees were long-coveted academic distinctions in Western Europe. Its students are said to have at one time numbered seven thousand, and were of various nationalities. Their memory is preserved by the very names of the old city streets—Irish street, English street, Scotch street, etc. One of the three divisions of the city was called Trian-Saxon, the Saxon's third, from the great number of Saxon students inhabiting it.

[9] Archbishop Healy, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

[10] His work, "The Destruction of Britain" ("De Excidio Britaniæ Liber Querulus"), is still extant, and shows that he was a man of large culture and great holiness, in every way qualified to rule the schools of Armagh.—Archbishop Healy.

"paragon of the wisdom of the Irish and head of the council of the west of Europe in piety and devotion;" the great Gelasius (Giolla Iosa, or servant of Jesus), who succeeded St. Malachy, raised the school to the zenith of its splendor and presided over a synod of twenty-six Bishops, held at Clone, in the County Kildare, in which it was enacted that no person should be allowed to teach divinity in any school in Ireland who had not qualified in the school of Armagh; Florence O'Gorman, a venerable sage who ruled the school for twenty years, and many others who as scribes, professors or moderators added each in his own sphere to its well-earned distinction. The work of the scribes was the transcription of manuscripts—books in the Teach-Screaptra, or House of Writings, the scriptorium of mediæval monasteries. To one of these patient penmen, Ferdomnach, who died in 844, we owe one of the oldest and most valuable literary treasures in Ireland—the famous Book of Armagh.[11]

[11] Written at the dictation of Torbach, who was Primate for one year and died on July 16, 807, having before his elevation to the Archbishopric been a scribe of Armagh himself. The original, of which it is a transcription, was even at that early date a very old manuscript volume, highly prized in the Church of Armagh, and so illegible from age and use that the transcriber had great difficulty in deciphering the genuine text. It contains a "Life of St. Patrick," the oldest in existence, written partly by Muirchu Maccu Mactheni at the request of Ædh, Bishop of Sletty, and partly by Bishop Tirechan at the dictation of St. Ultan, Bishop of Ardbraccan, in Meath, in 650, with annotations in Latin and Irish, the very oldest form of the vernacular to be found anywhere. "It is not too much, then, to say," says Archbishop Healy, "that the 'Life of St. Patrick' in the Book of Armagh is perhaps the oldest, and certainly the most authentic, document of its kind in existence in Ireland." A portion of the original volume was, beyond doubt, actually written by St. Patrick himself, for besides a treatise on the rights and privileges of Armagh, there is the well-known Confession of St. Patrick, followed by the words: "Hucusque volumen quod Patritius scripsit manu sua." Then there is an entire copy of the New Testament—the only complete copy of the Scriptures of the New Testament which has come down to our times from the Celtic Church of Ireland, the rest having been destroyed by the Danes—the gospels and epistles, including the spurious epistle to the Laodiceans, and a copy of the "Life of St. Martin of Tours," the father of monasticism in Gaul, by Sulpicius Severus. Archbishop Healy notes as one of the most remarkable features in the Book of Armagh that many of the Gospel headings are written in Greek characters, the last entry of all being a colophon of four Latin lines in Greek letters, showing clearly that even at this early date a knowledge of Greek was general in Irish schools. This book, from its sacred character and great antiquity, was regarded as the priceless treasure of the Church of St. Patrick. It was encased in a shrine in 937 by Donogh, son of Flann, King of Ireland, and a special custodian, called maor or steward, appointed to guard it, the office becoming hereditary in one family, who were assigned lands for their support, and thence came to be called MacMoyres—the descendants of the keeper. It was for ages counted one of the sacred relics, and its preservation was most carefully safeguarded. When Turgesius, or Ragnar Lodbrok, the Danish leader, invaded Ireland, about 831, and established paganism in Armagh, officiating himself

St. Patrick's immediate successor in the Primacy was his favorite disciple, Benen, or Benignus, son of Sescnen, whom, along with his family, he converted and baptized on his first apostolic journey northwards, when he sojourned on the banks of the stream now known as Nanny Water, in the County Meath, a little to the south of Drogheda. The Apostle seems to have cherished a special affection towards him, like that which St. Francis of Assisi, eight centuries later, cherished for his "dear little sheep of the good God." Brother Leo, Bishop Tirechan, in his annotations or notes on the history of St. Patrick, written about the middle of the seventh century, thus concisely relates the first meeting between the saint and one who was destined to be his successor in the Primacy: "He (St. Patrick) came in the evening to the River Ailbine (Delvin, County Meath), to a certain worthy man, and he baptized him, and he found with him a son who found favor with him, and he called him Benignus, for he laid hold of the feet of Patrick between his hands and breast, and he would not sleep near his father or mother, but wept that he might sleep with Patrick. When they had arisen the next morning, Patrick having blessed the father of Benen, ascended his chariot, and whilst he had one foot in the chariot and one foot upon the ground, the youthful Benen held tightly with both his hands the foot of Patrick, exclaiming: 'Let me be with Patrick, my true father!' And Patrick said: 'Baptize

---

as a high priest, Primate Forannon fled for refuge to Limerick, carrying with him the Book of Armagh. It is marvelous how it has existed and been preserved intact through all the storm and stress of the Danish and Anglo-Norman invasions, with their pillagings, plunderings and burnings; the civil wars and the terror and confusion that followed in the wake of the Reformation and Commonwealth. One of its hereditary custodians, Florence MacMoyre—a member of a family who from this circumstance got the name of MacMoyre, i. e., descendants of the maer, or keeper, who enjoyed a liberal land endowment in consideration of the importance of their trust—pawned it for £5 to a Protestant gentleman, Arthur Brownlow, of Lurgan, in whose family it continued down to 1853, when it was purchased for £300 by the late Dr. Reeves, from whom it passed to the Protestant Beresford, who presented it to Trinity College, Dublin. This Florence MacMoyre, sad to relate, was one of the perjured informers who swore away the life of the martyred Primate, Oliver Plunkett. The book originally consisted of 442 pages, of which ten are lost. With this exception, it is as perfect as when it was written. It is chiefly in Latin, with a good deal of old Irish interspersed. It was edited, with a view to publication, by Dr. Reeves, but he died before he completed an undertaking for which he was eminently qualified. It will, however, we are assured, be published. Meanwhile the Irish text has been edited with great erudition by the Rev. Edmund Hogan, S. J., and published. The exquisite penmanship and illumination are of the most minute delicacy, intricacy and faultless execution, evidencing the greatest artistic taste and skill. The artist-scribe, Ferdomnach, described by the "Four Masters," in recording his death in 844, as "a sage and choice scribe of the Church of Armagh," was unsurpassed at this kind of work even in the finest period of Irish art.

him and lift him into the chariot, for he is the heir of my kingdom.'" By this, says the author of the "Tripartite Life," he meant to signify that God had destined Benignus to succeed him in the Primatial See. The same author describes him as "adolescens facie decorus, vultu modestus, moribus integer, nomine uti et in re Benignus," and his voice "cunctos oblectans." It was this sweet voice, this organ which gave melodious expression to the Church's solemn chants and brought out all their beauty and mystical meaning in strains where the sound was a harmonious echo of the sense, which qualified him to be "psalmist" to St. Patrick, who had trained him from his youth upwards in all divine and human knowledge and leader of the choir of priests and monks at all the sacred functions. But were it not for his solid piety, this gift, like many other gifts of God which are used only to be abused, might have been his undoing, for while charming the ears, it captivated the heart of the susceptible maiden, Ercnat, the beautiful daughter of the dynast, Daire, the donor of the cathedral site. "C'est l'amour," says a French writer, "qui traine à la mort ou mène à la vie." Ercnat's love for Benignus, a pure, natural affection, became supernaturalized when with baptismal regeneration her soul awakened to a new life and the light of faith illuminated her intelligence. The "Martyrology of Donegal" in recording his death in 493, after he had ruled the Church and School of Armagh from 455 to 465 and reached the patriarchal age of 120, says: "The holy Benen was benign, was devout; he was a virgin without ever defiling his virginity, for when he was psalmsinger at Ard-Macha, along with his master, St. Patrick, Ercnat, daughter of Daire, loved him, and she was seized with a disease so that she died (appeared to die) suddenly; and Benen brought holy water to her from St. Patrick and he shook it upon her, and she arose alive and well; and she loved him spiritually afterwards, and she subsequently went to Patrick and confessed all her sins to him, and offered her virginity to God, so that she went to heaven; and the name of God, of Patrick and of Benen was magnified through it.".

To Benignus succeeded Jarlath, who governed the see for fourteen years; Cormac; Dublach, or Duach; the two Ailills, descendants of the Princes of Hy-Bressail, or Oneilland; and Segheve, during whose Primacy the city was twice burned. In 665 Armagh was visited by a pestilence which swept away two-thirds of the inhabitants, including Bishops and abbots. Thirty years afterwards, in 695, a synod was held in the city which enacted canons extant down to the seventeenth century. During the Primacy of Congus (730-750), who was both a poet and a learned scribe, King Flath-

bert, monarch of Ireland, abdicated and embraced the monastic life at Armagh (734).

Prior to 803 the Primate and his suffragan Bishops were obliged to attend the royal army when the King set out on some hostile expedition; but as predatory conflicts were of frequent occurrence, Conmach, deeming it indecorous that ministers of peace should be compelled to witness the horrors of war, directed Abbot Fothad, of Fahan, to draw up a remonstrance, styled *opusculu pro cleri defensione et immunitate*, which was presented to King Ædh, who henceforward exempted the Bishops and clergy from this service.[12] It was probably drawn up at the synod of Northern Bishops held at Rathcore, County Meath, in 804.

Nuada, who succeeded Primate Torbach, was abbot of a monastery near Lough Uamha (Cavetown Lough), Brefny, County Roscommon, and reluctantly accepting the Primatial dignity, was the first Archbishop who since the time of Cormace, the third Primate in succession to St. Patrick, made a visitation of Connaught as Patriarch of the kingdom.

Armagh was one of those cities which suffered most at the hands of the piratical tribes, a mixed race of Danes, Frisians, Norwegians, Swedes and Livonians, who ravaged Ireland in the ninth and tenth centuries. The Four Masters record eight pillagings and burnings by the Norsemen from 830 to 914. The valiant but fierce Turgesius or Thorgis forced the Primate to take flight and seek shelter in Kildare, whither he was pursued and compelled, along with the clergy of that "holy shrine," to lurk for years in obscure woods and subterranean caves.

The Danes made Armagh one of their headquarters until defeated by Niall. Those of Dublin in 895, under their leader, Iron-Knee, entered Armagh, despoiled the city, destroyed part of the cathedral, demolished several sacred edifices and withdrew with 710 captives. In 923 Dubliter, a priest of Armagh, suffered martyrdom in Cell-Sleibhe (Killevy, County Armagh) at the hands of the Danes of Carlingford Lough.

All this turbulence and turmoil necessarily had its effect upon

[12] King Æd Ornidhe (Ordnee), who reigned from 797 to 819, on one occasion, in 803, made a hostile incursion to Leinster and forced Conmach, the Primate of Armagh, and all his clergy to attend him. Having, on the march, arrived at a place called Dun-Cuar, now Rathcore, in Meath, the Archbishop expostulated with him on the impropriety of bringing the clergy on such expeditions. The King referred the matter to his tutor and chief adviser, Fothad, who, after due deliberation, pronounced judgment exempting the clergy forever from attending armies in war. He delivered his decision in the form of a short canon of three verses, which is still extant, whence he has ever since been known as Fothad of the Canon.—Dr. Joyce's "Short History of Ireland," p. 190.

the Church and laxity and disorganization in the ecclesiastical order followed in its train. A remarkable instance of this is furnished by the fact that the Primacy was usurped by one powerful family, supposed to be descendants of the local dynast or King Daire, who held hereditary possession of it for about two hundred years, from the death of St. Mælbrigid (926-927) to the accession of St. Malachy.[13] In this connection it is noteworthy that the two first intended Bishops of this long succession, Joseph and Mælpatrick, are styled "princes of Armagh." St. Celsus, or Cellach, the immediate predecessor of St. Malachy, was a member of this family and was only twenty-six when he succeeded to the Archbishopric, being the youngest of all the Primates. Notwithstanding his relationship to the usurpers and being desirous of bringing about a reversion to a better order of things,[14] he fixed upon Malachy O'Morgair, or O'Mungair (a name which afterwards was changed to O'Doherty), Bishop of Connor, a see united subsequently to that of Down, as one best fitted to put an end to the usurpation of the Primacy, which lasted for two centuries. Wishful of having him as his successor, he sent him his pastoral staff in token of choice, but St. Malachy declined to accept the Primacy until duly elected at a national synod, which was convoked about

[13] Many grave abuses had crept into the Church during the Danish troubles—nearly all caused by the encroachments of the lay chiefs—but they were all disciplinal irregularities. One grave abuse we find frequently mentioned—the usurpation of bishoprics and abbacies by laymen, who, of course, did not attempt to discharge any spiritual functions. Before the time of St. Celsus, St. Malachy's predecessor, eight married laymen usurped the See of Armagh ("Cambrensis Eversus," ed. 1850, p. 635). We find no indication of any defection in doctrine—any taint of heresy or schism. The ecclesiastical authorities exerted themselves to correct these abuses, and their activity and solicitude are shown by a number of synods occurring about this time. That religion never lost its hold on the Irish Kings and chiefs, even during the time of their bitterest internecine struggles, is shown by the successful interference for peace on several occasions of the Archbishop of Armagh.—Joyce's "Short History of Ireland," p. 238.

Most of these usurpers, who were laymen or married men, paid regularly ordained prelates to perform all necessary functions, keeping for themselves the lands, the nomination to the churches, and even the titles of Bishops and Abbots of Armagh. St. Bernard ("Vita Malachiæ," c. 10) says that this wicked and adulterous generation were so obstinate in asserting this right of hereditary succession that although clerics of their blood were wanting, Bishops were never wanting—that is, Bishops who were not even clerics—learned enough, but without orders. ("Denique jam octo extiterant ante Celsum vivi uxorati et obsque ordinibus, litterati tamen.")

[14] St. Celsus was, above all things, a peacemaker. When the country was so torn by feuds and hails that, as the "Four Masters" express it, Ireland was "a trembling sod," he made several journeys here and there endeavoring to make peace, being at one time absent from his see for thirteen months. During the last of these journeys of mercy he died in 1129 at the Monastery of Ardpatrick, in Limerick, and was buried with great honor and solemnity at Lismore.

1134 by Gilbert of Limerick, the Papal Legate. Meanwhile Murrough, cousin of Celsus, retained possession of the see for three years and for two years longer disputed the Primacy with Malachy, until the latter expelled his opponents and recovered from them the sacred emblems of Primatial jurisdiction, the Book of Armagh, called the Canon of St. Patrick, and the staff of Jesus,[15] said to have been given by our Lord to the Apostle of Ireland.

St. Malachy's election to the Primacy marked an epoch of transition, when the old order changed giving place to new. He was the man of Providence raised up to do a great work for the Church. Celsus, who was a pious prelate zealous for the beauty of God's house, was farsighted when, as he lay dying at Ardpatrick, County Limerick, exiled from his see by usurpers, his eyes rested upon the Bishop of Connor and he pointed to him as the one worthiest to wear the mitre and wield the crozier of St. Patrick. Born in 1095, he was educated partly at Armagh, where his father was senior lecturer of the famous university school, then presided over by Bishop Malchus, who had been trained in the great Norman monastery of Winchester and in the equally famous school of Lismore, was ordained by Celsus in 1119, became in due time abbot of the celebrated monastery of Bangor, on the shores of Belfast Lough, and in 1125 Bishop of Connor, from which he was translated to Armagh in 1134, accepting the Primacy only on condition that, after he had reformed the church of Armagh, he should be allowed to retire to his beloved obscurity, for he had drunk deep of the monastic spirit which he had imbibed from Abbot Imar O'Ǽdhacan (Ivor O'Hagan), an anchorite who lived holily in a cell near the Church of SS. Peter and Paul at Armagh, of which he was the founder, just as he had caught the Roman spirit at Lismore, which had long been in close touch with the Continent.

He changed the whole face of things—nay, more, he laid the axe to the root which was the fruitful source of many evils—during his three years' tenure of the Primacy, from which he retired to

[15] St. Bernard thus refers to it as one of the insignia of the See of Armagh in his "Life of St. Malachy:" "Porro Nigellus, videns sibi imminere fugam, tulit secum insignia quœdam œdis illius, textum, scilicet Evangeliorum qui fuit beati Patricii, baculumque auro tectum, et gemmis pretiosissimis adornatum: quem nominant baculum Jesu, eo quod ipse Dominus (ut fert opinio) eum suis manibus tenuerit, atque formaverit." In the poem of St. Fiacc in the Book of Armagh it is stated that St. Tassach, who lived in the fifth century and was skilled in the goldsmith's art, first adorned it with a precious covering. William FitzAldelin, who pillaged the city and churches at Armagh, brought it to Dublin in 1179 and deposited it in the Church of the Holy Trinity (Christ Church), from which it was taken, with other relics, in the time of Henry VIII. and burned in High street hard by.

Down in 1137. Evolving order out of chaos, he reorganized and disciplined the church as he had organized and disciplined the See of Connor, "laboring in all things, doing the work of an evangelist, fulfilling the ministry;" traversing on foot the mountains and glens of Antrim, accompanied only by a few disciples, his faithful co-workers and edified witnesses of his ceaseless activity, unflagging zeal, ascetic self-denial and fervent piety; feeding and cherishing the flock of God like a good shepherd of the souls committed to his charge; living a life of truly apostolic poverty, having neither a house of his own, nor servants, nor fixed revenues, nor any regular episcopal mensa. Though his work in Armagh was much more difficult than that which he had accomplished in Antrim, he was completely successful. He restored the Primacy to its position of dignity, authority and independence, and after three years of patient and prudent labor caused himself to be universally recognized as the legitimate possessor of the power and privileges which have ever rightfully belonged to the successor and representative of St. Patrick in the See of Armagh. Nor did his work end there and then. He brought about a general restoration of ecclesiastical discipline and reformation of morals throughout the whole country after he returned from Rome, invested by Pope Innocent II. with the plenary powers of Papal Legate. He was unquestionably the greatest of all the Primates since the time of St. Patrick.

The work of reformation which St. Celsus and St. Malachy began was carried on by the latter's successor in the Primacy, Gelasius (Gilla MacLiach), whose reign Archbishop Healy says is remarkable for two things—first, the success with which he asserted his jurisdiction as Primate during his visitations in all parts of Ireland, and, secondly, for his zeal in holding synods to correct abuses and reform the morals both of the clergy and of the people.[16] During the centuries preceding the twelfth century the jurisdiction of the Primate was practically in abeyance; if it was recognized at all in the south of Ireland, it was certainly merely nominal.[17] Gelasius convened the Synod of Holmpatrick (a small island near Skerries, called by the Four Masters Inis-Padraig, or Patrick's Island), which formally recognized the superiority of Armagh and was attended by twenty-two Bishops, five Bishops-elect and three hundred priests. It postulated for and obtained from the Papal Legate, Cardinal Paparo, who was present, the four palls which legally constituted four Archbishops in Ireland for the first time. At the Synod of Mellifort, the parent house of the great Cistercian Order,

[16] "Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars," p. 359.
[17] *Loc. cit.*

introduced into Ireland by St. Malachy, Primate Gelasius excommunicated Donogh O'Melaghlin, Prince or King of Meath, for his impiety and contempt of Primatial authority. He consecrated St. Lorcan, or Lawrence O'Toole, to be Archbishop of Dublin—the first prelate of that see who was ever consecrated in Ireland—resolved not to tolerate any longer the claim of the Archbishops of Canterbury to metropolitan jurisdiction. In 1170, the year after the arrival of the Anglo-Normans, he held the last synod of his clergy in his own city of Armagh to concert means to expel the foreigners before they could secure a foothold in the country. "Alas!" says Archbishop Healy,[18] "for the aged Gelasius, who had labored so hard and so long for the Irish Church and the Irish people. He saw the princes of his country bow the knee in homage to the triumphant invader; he saw her prelates meet in Cashel at Henry's summons to endorse his laws; he saw her petty chieftains either warring with each other or allied with the Norman. Then, and only then, the old man came from his episcopal city and kissed the hand of Henry in his new capital in Dublin. He had his old white cow driven before him to give him milk, which was his only sustenance. He paid his homage to the King, and then returned home with a sad heart to Patrick's royal city. Two years after he died, at the age of eighty-five, and after his death was recognized and honored as a saint by the entire Church in Ireland."

Conor, son of MacConcaille and abbot of the Monastery of SS. Peter and Paul, who succeeded Gelasius in the Primacy in 1174, died on his way back from Rome in the following year, leaving behind him a reputation for sanctity. Though venerated as a saint under the title of St. Concord for over seven hundred years at Chambery,[19] where his relics are preserved, he remained entirely forgotten in his native country till within comparatively recent years. In

[18] *Op. cit.*, p. 363.

[19] The Bollandists in their life of the saint (June 4) give authentic memorials which confirm the traditional cultus observed at Chambery. Foundations for Masses to be celebrated in the chapel of St. Concord had been established there for three hundred years prior to 1689. Relics taken from his tomb in 1490 were deposited in a shrine presented by Philippe d'Allegret, treasurer of Savoy. In a hymn to St. Concord found by Father Papebroch, the well-known Bollandist, in 1689 he is thus invoked:

Ave, Pater gloriose;
Salve, Proesul pretiose,
Quondam Pater Yllandiae
Nunc decus Sabaudiae.

The use of the word "Yllandia" for Ireland is one of the earliest transitions from the ancient name, Hibernia. Dr. Dixon, who said Mass before the shrine in which the body of his sainted predecessor in the Primacy rested, clothed in rich Pontifical vestments, brought back as precious relics to Ireland a portion of his rib, preserved in the Presentation Convent, Drogheda, and a thigh bone at the Sacred Heart Convent, Armagh.

traveling homeward from the Eternal City he halted at the Monastery of Lemenc, close to the town of Chambery, in Savoy, where he found a church dedicated to St. Peter and where the monks received him with great honor. He told them he came to die in their midst, and before long was seized with a mortal illness. His servants or the religious who accompanied him, afflicted at the sight of their dying master, were comforted by him with these words: "In Ireland I served for many years a Church of SS. Peter and Paul in Armagh. I have thus paid my homage to the Church of St. Peter at Rome, and it is in the Church of St. Peter at Lemenc I shall be buried." Having received the last rites, he joined his hands across his breast and gave up his soul to God. Miracles were wrought at his tomb and the sick and infirm were cured through his intercession, particularly during the plague which raged there in 1630. In 1643 a confraternity was established under his patronage and was enriched with numerous indulgences by Innocent X. and Clement X. Long before that the Benedictines were authorized by the Holy See to celebrate his office as a double major feast on June 4, the anniversary of his death. In 1792 some members of the confraternity buried his relics in a secret place, and thus preserved them from the sacrilegious frenzy of the French Revolution. In 1853 they were taken to Rome and authenticated and then sent back to Lemenc, where great solemnities in their honor took place in 1854.

Gilbert O'Caran, translated from Raphoe to Armagh in 1175, died in 1180 and was succeeded in 1181 by Thomas (Tomaltach) O'Conor, who in 1184 resigned the see to Mælisu O'Carroll. The latter died on his way to Rome that year and was followed to the grave by his successor, Amlave O'Murray, in the year ensuing. After the decease of the last named, Primate O'Conor resumed the see, which he governed for sixteen years. It was during his Primacy and at his request that Jocelyn compiled his well-known life of St. Patrick. After his death there were four rival candidates, three Anglo-Normans and one Irishman, and a conflict arose through the interference of King John, whose policy and that of his successor was by forcing English clerics into the cathedral chapter to secure the election of their own countrymen and thus bring the Irish Church under the dominion of the English Crown and plunder it legally by appropriating the revenues during a vacancy in the see. An appeal to Rome resulted in the choice of Eugene MacGillaweer being ratified by the Holy See, despite the English monarch. He was preesnt at the Council of Lateran the English monarch. He was present at the Council of Lateran ville, Archdeacon of Armagh (1217-1227), and Donat O'Fidabra,

or Feery, translated from Clogher, after whom the see was vacant for three years.

In 1245 the name of the Archbishop of Armagh, Albertus Armachanus (Albert Suerber, a Dominican of Cologne), preceded the names of all the Bishops of Italy, Spain and France in the order of signature to the acts of the Council of Lyons. Reginald, or Raynor, and the Dominican Primate was, after the Primacy of Abraham O'Connellan, succeeded by the Dominican Bishop of Raphoe, Patrick O'Scanlon, to whom Pope Urban IV. (November, 1263), issued a Bull confirming the dignity of the Primacy of All Ireland to the see. He is styled in the Octavian Register "sixty-eighth Archbishop after St. Patrick" who had presided over the see "viriliter et reverenter novem annis." Primate Nicholas MacMalisu, a canon of Armagh, who was unanimously elected "per viam compromissi," and who is referred to in the Annals of Ulster as the most pious ecclesiastic in Ireland in his time, strongly opposed the appointment of English ecclesiastics to Irish sees, refusing for a long time to confirm St. Leger as Bishop of Meath.

The Archbishop of Dublin during the Primacy of Roland Joyce (who came after John Taaffe, who never saw his see, and Walter Joyce, a Dominican and confessor to Edward II., who resigned the Archbishopric of Armagh in 1311) contested the right of the Northern Primate to have his cross borne before him in Dublin, a point long in dispute and again and again raised.

Edward Bruce, brother of the Scotch hero, Robert Bruce, invaded Ulster in the fourteenth century, and during his progress through the province sacked Armagh and reduced the Primate to a condition of extreme poverty. But poor and oppressed as he was, the Archbishop was present at the battle of Faughard, near Dundalk, on Saturday, October 14, 1318, when Bruce was defeated by the English forces under the command of Sir John Bermingham. The Primate, before the battle commenced, blessed the English soldiers, moving from rank to rank and stimulating them to deeds of valor in so noble a cause. John Maupas and Edward Bruce fought hand-in-hand. The Scot fell before his opponent, who, pierced with mortal wounds, sank, a victor, on the dead body of his prostrate enemy. The Scottish army was totally routed and Armagh rescued from the invader.

Primate Richard FitzRalph, who had been Chancellor of Oxford, was consecrated in July, 1346, and died at Avignon in December, 1360, his remains being translated in 1370 to Dundalk, where he was regarded as a saint. His relics are said to have worked miracles. In a synod held at Drogheda on June 20, 1545, it was ordained that the festival of St. Ralph should be celebrated with

nine lessons on the morrow of the feast of SS. John and Paul, June 27.

As Armagh, from age to age, added to the list of those who gained for Ireland the name of the island of saints and scholars, so did it help to perpetuate that traditional association of the ideas of faith and fatherland which at many an eventful epoch caused prelates, priests and people to make common cause. Milo Sweetman, who was advanced on October 9, 1361, from the position of treasurer of the Cathedral of Kilkenny to the Primacy, was one of those who struck a patriotic note and attitude which it is opportune to recall. Six years after his promotion what is known in Irish history as the "Black Statute of Kilkenny" was passed by a servile Parliament summoned by the Duke of Clarence. It marked the culminating point of that assumption of superiority on the part of the English settlers over the native Irish. One of its enactments was that no "mere Irish" were to obtain any ecclesiastical dignity or benefice or be admitted as subjects into any monastery among the English. The King thought to carry things with as high a hand when it was a question of voting supplies to help him in his foreign wars for the aggrandizement of England. The Irish Parliament in Dublin having refused on account of the poverty of the nation, he summoned both clergy and laity to meet him and his counsel in England. The Primate replied that they were not bound by the liberties, privileges, rights, laws and customs of the Church and land of Ireland to elect any of their clergy and send them to any part of England for the purpose of holding Parliaments or councils. He sent representatives, however, but under protest and with this proviso, "that we by no means grant to our said representatives any power of assenting to any burdens or subsidies to be imposed on us or our clergy to which we cannot yield by reason of our poverty." It was on account of this chronic poverty of a despoiled and distracted country that during the Primacy of Primate Swayne (1418-1439) the revenues of the see were insufficient to support the dignity, although Louth, previously comprised in the Bishopric of Clogher, had nearly a century before that been added to Armagh.

The Primacy of Octavian Spinelli, who had been nominated by Sixtus IV. (1478), was notable for the firm opposition which the Archbishop gave to the claims of Lambert Simnel, whom many then and some since believed to be Edward Plantagenet, Earl of Warwick, only son of George, Duke of Clarence, brother of Edward IV.

Primate O'Tighe (temp. Eliz.) was another of those militant churchmen of the type and mould of Roland Joyce. He accom-

panied Shane O'Neill when the latter appeared with his army on the hill outside the walls of Armagh to oppose Sussex, who fortified himself in the Cathedral and was bent on bringing the powerful Ulster chieftain into submission. Mass was celebrated by one of the friars, and the Primate walked thrice up and down the lines, exhorting the Irish soldiers to go forward, as God was on their side; but when his successor, Primate Creagh, preaching before O'Neill and six hundred of his soldiers in the Cathedral, after Shane had been proclaimed a "traitor," inculcated loyalty to the English sovereign, the enraged Earl five days afterwards burned the roof of the Cathedral and broke down the walls. So dreadful was the havoc perpetrated by the indignant and vindictive chieftain that Camden says: "In our memory the church and city of Armagh were so foully devastated by the rebel Shane O'Neill that they lost all their ancient beauty and glory, and nothing remaineth at this day but a few small wattled cottages and the ruinous walls of a monastery, priory and the Primate's palace." Shane asserted that he had burned the Cathedral to prevent the English troops from occupying it. After the fire the Primate, it is recorded, went into an open field to pronounce a solemn anathema on the perpetrator of the sacrilegious outrage. The Archbishop, notwithstanding his preaching of loyalty, ended his days in the Tower of London on October 14, 1585, poisoned, as it was commonly believed at the time. Primate McGauran, who succeeded, met a violent death likewise, having been transfixed with a horseman's lance in an encounter with the English troops at a place called Sciath na Feart (the shield of miracles). Church as well as country fared badly during Tyrone's insurrection, which reduced Ulster to a howling wilderness. Primates Lombard and MacCawell never saw their sees, although Stewart ("History of Armagh") says it is certain that the Culdees[20] had continued to officiate in the

[20] An inquisition held on March 24 1625, at the Priory of the Culdees, Armagh, revealed the fact that the prior and monks had long totally forsaken the place. The last survivors of this religious community had passed away about 1600. Ussher says they performed Divine service there in his memory. They were perhaps the last remnant of the Culdees of Ireland, or possibly of the British Isles. A doubt submitted in 1633 to the Holy See by Primate O'Reilly throws a last lingering light on the Culdees. The Chapter of Armagh comprising only five, the dean, archdeacon, theologian, precentor and treasurer, it was considered advisable to incorporate with them twelve priests belonging to the Culdee community, with the proviso that they should resume the ancient practice of singing the Divine Office in common, as their predecessors had done, in the Cathedral of Armagh. The prior, one of those who submitted the question whether they had acted in accordance with canon law, had been prior of the College of Culdees. St. Ængus, a descendant of the royal race of the Dalorodians of Ulster, born in the neighborhood of Clonenagh about the middle of the eighth century, was the first to whom the name of Culdee was given.

Cathedral choir in the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth. In 1559 James Donnelly, the last prior, surrendered the abbey of the canons regular of St. Augustin, and on February 25, 1614 or 1615, a surrender was made by Primate Christopher Hampton of all the estate anciently belonging to the See of Armagh.

Primate Hugh O'Reilly took a prominent part in the political events connected with the rising of 1641 and the Confederation of Kilkenny, being one of the representatives of Ulster on the National Council. The name of "Hugo Armacanus" is appended to various documents executed about that period by the most active of the Catholic leaders. The Primate headed the spiritual peers, and both at Kilkenny and Cashel and in presence of the Papal Nuncio, Rinuccini, took precedence of all the other Catholic prelates. On August 12, 1650, he signed the famous declaration at Jamestown against the continuance of His Majesty's authority in the person of the Duke of Ormond, with an excommunication annexed. He was the supreme head of the civil as well as of the ecclesiastical government of Ireland in his time, the inspiring mind of the patriotic movement for the liberation of Irish Catholics from the thraldom of centuries, the real leader of the war which the Ulster Irish pursued to the bitter end, while the leaders in the other provinces were surrendering to the enemy, and died fighting to the last. For more than seventy years before his promotion no Catholic Primate had resided in the archdiocese,[21] and advantage was taken of the enforced absence of the shepherds to corrupt the faith of the flock, particularly by Ussher. Primate O'Reilly labored un-

---

He was not only an accomplished scholar, but a model of every virtue. Hence he came to be called the Culdee—that is, the Ceile De, or servant of God. Afterwards the name was given to other ascetic solitaries, who, though not a religious order in the proper sense of the word, still formed communities of anchorites, living apart, but yet frequently meeting in the same church for devotional purposes and recognizing a common superior. Later on members of the secular clergy formed themselves into somewhat similar communities, and came to be known by the same name. They were in reality, however, what is known as Canons Secular—that is, a body of secular clergy living apart, but subject to a common rule, which was generally the rule of St. Augustin. The Ceile De of the earlier period divided his time between prayer, manual labor and literary employment. He was never a burden to others, for he and his brethren contrived to procure from their little farms not only their own scant and meagre fare, but also the means of hospitable entertainment for the poor and the stranger. (Archbishop Healy, "Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars," p. 405.) In this connection it may be noted that the monastic clergy of St. Patrick's time bound themselves by vows to cultivate the deserts in which they lived for the use of the poor. Their successors gave up the reclaimed lands for the joint benefit of the indigent. Hence we find so many commons in the neighborhood of monasteries.

[21] Father Cahill, of Dublin, who got an episcopal ring made for him, was prosecuted by the Government and sent to prison, from which he escaped.

ceasingly for ten years to defeat his efforts, and at the end of that decade it was found that the Catholic population of the see had multiplied, that chapels had been erected in every direction and that the tide of conversions was flowing Romewards.

His successor, Edmund O'Reilly, a Dublin priest, was succeeded in turn by the martyred Primate, Oliver Plunkett, a near relative of the Earl of Fingal, whose saintly life and holy and heroic death at Tyburn in 1681 shed additional lustre upon the see. He is one of the Irish martyrs whose beatification is at present under the consideration of the Congregation of Rites, and it is quite within the range of probability that, like some of his predecessors in the Primacy, he will before long be raised to the honors of the altars. His head, enclosed in a shrine, is in custody of the Dominican nuns of Siena Convent, Drogheda. Primate Maguire, who followed him in the perilous penal times, had to go into exile and died in Paris. After his flight no Primate was resident in Armagh for twenty-three years. Hugh MacMahon, translated from Kilmore in 1714 by a decree of Propaganda, died in Dublin in August, 1737, and was outlawed. Upon his accession he drew attention in an elaborate report to Propaganda to the terrible condition of the diocese, rent by internal schism in face of the persecution to which it was subjected by the operation of the penal code, and four years later informed the Internuncio of the consternation caused in Ireland by the arrest of the Archbishop of Dublin. Letters are extant from the Primate to the Cardinals of Propaganda in 1720-21, in which he relates the difficulties under which he wrote his great work, "Jus Primatiale Armacanum,"[22] difficulties created not only by Protestant persecutors, but by false brethren, who for the sake of the reward[23] offered for the apprehension of a Catholic Bishop were watching all the roads and searching for him everywhere. He was obliged to wander from place to place, often saying Mass and administering confirmation in the open air or in a deserted limekiln or in the solitude of a wood or sequestered valley, for, except in Louth, he had scarcely a chapel in the whole of his diocese. What the Protestants contemptuously called "Papist Mass-houses" were described by one of them (Dr. Browne) as "no more

[22] Written in reply to an anonymous pamphlet by John Hennessy, a Jesuit of Clonmel, and which in a brief from the Pope he was directed to have published.

[23] On February 28, 1744, the then Viceroy, the Duke of Devonshire, issued a proclamation commanding magistrates to hunt out the clergy, offering an increased reward for the apprehension and conviction of priests and Bishops. The sum of £50 was hitherto the highest price paid for catching a Bishop and £20 for a priest; £150 more was added to the former and £50 to the latter reward, while £200 was offered for the conviction of whoever should harbor them.

than open cabins." A poem in the Irish language, written in 1738 by Patrick O'Prunty, a local rhymster, on the occasion of Primate Bernard MacMahon—near relative and successor of Hugh MacMahon—going to live at Ballymacscanlan, in the neighborhood of Dundalk, fervidly eulogizes one of those prelates who, despite all the terrorism of the penal laws, continued to watch over their flocks:

Of welcomes ninety millions I give to thee
Who comest with Christ's symbol in thy hand;
Gifted with wisdom and with power supreme
To rule and judge the myriads of our land.

A glorious tree thou art, dispensing shade,
Sprung from the noble root of Heremon;
True essence of the best blood of the Gaels,
Whose sceptre ruled our soil in days long gone.

Rich jewel of the Church of Innisfail,
Successor of St. Patrick, psalmist sweet,
Whose voice is loudest in the sacred choirs,
Praising the Lord in strains most exquisite.

This Primate wrote to Dr. Linegar, Archbishop of Dublin, on November 7, 1741, telling him that four bailiffs had been hunting for him and that he had been obliged to leave his usual place of safety. Ross MacMahon, a nephew of Hugh MacMahon, after filling the Primacy for one year, died in 1748. His successor, Primate Michael O'Reilly, soon after his translation from Derry —a diocese which suffered more, perhaps, from persecution than any other in Ireland[24]—was arrested along with eighteen of his priests in the neighborhood of Dundalk for the sole offense of meeting together, which at that time was construed into a crime. They were, however, set at liberty after being closely examined by Limerick, when it was found that they had only met for the purpose of regulating about holidays lately retrenched and receiving the sacred oils. Information having been laid against him that he was collecting funds to set the Pretender on the throne, the Viceroy directed Lord Limerick to have the Primate arrested and lodged in prison, where he was detained till, having been found to be wholly innocent of the imputed crime, he was discharged. Cardinal Moran was shown in the neighborhood of Termonfeckin a small thatched house in which the Primate had lived, and under the thatch a narrow loft formed of the dry branches of trees, where at times he used to lie concealed while the priest-hunters were in close pursuit. A short distance from the hut, at a spot

[24] During the whole of the seventeenth century it was bereft of a Bishop, owing to the virulent spirit of the Scotch and English planters and the systematic extirpation of the Catholic proprietary and population. From 1601, when Bishop Redmond O'Gallagher shed his blood for the faith, Derry had seen no Bishop of its own until 1739.

where the main road crosses a little stream, tradition tells that he remained bent under the arch and up to his knees in water while a troop of military, scouring the country in search of him, were galloping along the road.

Primate Anthony Blake could never be prevailed upon to reside permanently in his diocese, and as soon as his visitations were over, returned to Galway. The chapel which served his successor, Primate Richard O'Reilly, called the Angel of Peace, as a pro-cathedral was outside Westgate, Drogheda, for Catholic chapels, when tolerated at all, were only allowed outside the walls of a town. The Primate, however, broke through this unjust and bigoted exclusion and laid the foundation stone of a church inside the walls. The Protestant Mayor and Corporation, wearing their robes and having the mace and sword borne before them, forbade the Primate to proceed further, warned him that it was against the law and threatened to take legal measures of prevention if he continued the ceremonies. Lord Bellew, of Barmeath, a Catholic, in hot indignation jumped forward and harangued the Protestant Councillors in such terms that the Corporation withdrew, and nothing more was heard of the opposition.[25] It was the little rift in the clouds, the first streak of light heralding the dawn of a better day. The lot of Dr. Curtis, who succeeded to the Primacy in 1819, was cast in happier times. He lived to witness the daybreak of Catholic Emancipation when Daniel O'Connell—the greatest Catholic leader that Ireland or, perhaps, any country produced—achieved his famous bloodless victory. Even before that a change had come over the country. The spirit which inspired the penal laws had so far passed or was passing away that after Dr. Curtis' consecration the Protestant Corporation presented him with the freedom of the town in a gold box. He got permission to erect a bell in his church, another concession which marked an altered phase of feeling, for until then no bell or steeple was allowed to a Catholic chapel, the congregation being brought together by the sound of a hand bell. Born under the shadow of the penal code which weighed like a nightmare upon Catholic Ireland, when Catholics were so completely ignored that the laws did not presume their existence, he took a very active and influential part in the long and strenuous struggle for constitutional liberty and equality. He was a prelate of great distinction, with statesmanlike breadth and grasp of mind, and was greatly esteemed by the Duke of Wellington, to whom he had rendered signal service during the Peninsular War. He and Dr. Doyle—the famous Bishop of Kildare—were the first Irish Bishops to join the Catholic Association. He passed away

[25] The church, which cost £20,000, was opened in December, 1793.

in 1832 and was succeeded by Dr. Thomas Kelly, who was only forty-three years of age, when, after a brief tenure of the Primacy, he died a martyr to charity, having caught the fever in ministering to a soldier in the barracks. In holiness of life he was a fitting successor to so many saintly prelates who preceded him. In manner he was considered austere and reserved and was commonly believed to practice great austerity. He walked every morning to St. Peter's, Drogheda, where he celebrated Mass. As he walked down Lawrence street and along West street, bowed in solemn meditation or absorbed in prayer, his stooped, emaciated form at once attracted attention. The people looked on him as a living saint. He was worn to a thread, and when the doctor who was called in examined him after he became unconscious on the day of his death, he found a coarse hair shirt next to his skin.

The commencement of the building of the new Cathedral, which is a striking evidence of the Church's marvelous resurrection, growth and vitality in the land, was the chief event which distinguished the Primacy of Dr. Crolly. Prior to that the old chapel of St. Malachy, a wretched structure erected in 1750 in an enclosure off Chapel lane, almost on the site of the house where St. Malachy was born, was the sole place of worship possessed by the Catholics of Armagh—an improvement, it is true, on the "Mass gardens" in which their harassed and hunted forefathers, cowering under the lash of the penal laws, had stealthily met to commune with God in prayer and receive the Bread of Life from the trembling hands of some fugitive priest, but wholly inadequate to the needs of the congregation. Dr. Crolly's ambition was to build a cathedral worthy of the city and See of St. Patrick, "the mistress and metropolis of Ireland." The first difficulty he had to overcome was to procure a site. The ground of Armagh city and suburbs consisted almost entirely of "see land," and formed the mensal estate or demesne of the Protestant Primate, with the exception of a noble eminence called Sandy Hill on the north between the Benburb and Charlemont roads, overlooking the entire city and neighborhood. A lease in perpetuity of this was obtained from the landlord, the Earl of Dartrey, and the foundation stone was laid on St. Patrick's Day, 1840, in presence of a vast multitude, such a gathering as had not been witnessed in Armagh for generations. The county roads were as converging torrents that combined to swell a veritable ocean of humanity which, after flooding the ample slopes of Sandy Hill, overflowed the entire city; hundreds, it is said, came and went that day who were never able to get even within sight of the Cathedral foundations.[26] Notwithstanding the many and severe

[26] "Historical and Descriptive Guide to St. Patrick's Cathedral, Armagh," p. 6.

trials which he had to endure at the hands of rabid Orangemen[27] and the building of a seminary, Dr. Crolly devoted nine laborious years to the prosecution of his great undertaking, until famine and fever in black '47 desolated the land and diverted attention to more pressing needs. On the Good Friday of 1849 he suddenly succumbed to an attack of cholera, then epidemic in Drogheda, whither he had gone from Armagh for the Holy Week ceremonies, and was buried in his own unfinished Cathedral in a vaulted tomb in the crypt beneath the centre of the choir, the first Primate laid to rest in Armagh since the days of Brian Boru, for during a period of nearly three hundred years, since the time of Queen Mary, a Catholic Bishop dared not approach within three miles of, much less live in the Primatial city, where he was the first to resume residence. During the Primacy of Dr. Cullen, who succeeded after nearly a year's interregnum, nothing was done in furtherance of the project, and for five years the low outline of its naked walls stood lonely and neglected, till the Catholics of Armagh began to fear that their great undertaking was about to degenerate into that saddest monument of blasted hopes, an unfinished ruin.[28] It was, however, successfully and strenuously resumed by Dr. Dixon, who is regarded as its second founder and who, before he died, had the satisfaction of seeing almost completed (the two western spires alone excepted) the whole grand exterior edifice. The advancing years and precarious health of his successor, Primate Kieran, interposed another obstacle to the progress of the work which it fell to the lot of Dr. McGettigan, translated by Pius IX. from Raphoe to Armagh in 1870, to take vigorously in hand. After completing the two principal spires, decorating the still bare and naked interior, putting in at his own expense the eastern stained glass window, with its inscription to the merits and memory of Primates Crolly and Dixon, ornamenting the Lady Chapel and roof of the choir with fine mural paintings and erecting the grand entrance and an imposing seven-terraced flight of steps leading to the spacious piazza fronting the western doors,[29] the Cathedral was solemnly dedicated on August 24, 1873, in presence of an assemblage of about twenty thousand people gathered within and

[27] On July 12, 1845, a serious riot took place in Armagh, on the occasion of an Orange procession, when an inoffensive Catholic was brutally murdered. The Primate headed the funeral, which was a manifestation of public indignation against the Government that had left the Catholics at the mercy of a band of armed desperadoes. During a sermon on the following Sunday he alluded to the crime, denouncing the perpetrator and weeping copiously as he proceeded.

[28] "Guide," p. 7.

[29] Most, if not all, of these, it was eventually discovered, the Primate paid for himself.

outside. A former Primate, Cardinal Cullen—the first Irish churchman ever raised to the dignity of membership of the Sacred College—presided, and the dedication sermon was preached by the great Dominican pulpit orator, Father Tom Burke, the Irish Lacordaire, in place of Cardinal Manning, who was to have delivered the discourse, but was unable, through illness, to fulfill his engagement. The expenditure on the Cathedral up to the end of Dr. McGettigan's episcopate has been roughly estimated at £70,000.

Finis coronat opus. Cardinal Logue has crowned all his predecessors' work and his own by the purchase of Lord Dartrey's interest in the site and the adjoining grounds, seven acres in extent; the complete and perfect renovation of the interior decorations; and the big bazaar of 1900, which netted £30,000—beating the world's records of bazaars—an achievement worthy of the popular prelate who, when Bishop of Raphoe, collected in one year nearly as large an amount for the relief of the distressed peasantry of Donegal. His Eminence may well say, with Horace, *Exegi monumentum ære perennius.* The noble Gothic fane which dominates and adorns the old Primatial city, historic Armagh, will be an enduring memorial of the tireless energy and great zeal of the Cardinal Primate whose name will be writ large in the annals of the Irish Church.

R. F. O'Connor.

Cork, Ireland.

CHURCH AND STATE.

VIII.

THE REIGN OF JUSTINIAN.

COUNT JUSTINIAN, whose zeal for the orthodox faith had proved so important a factor in bringing to an end the Acacian schism, was elevated April, 527, to the rank of Emperor, and the following August, by the death of his uncle, became sole ruler of the empire. His accession to the throne gave the greatest satisfaction to the orthodox party, whose cause had suffered not a little from the heretical leanings of Zeno, Basiliscus and Anastasius. His religious views at this time left nothing to be desired, and his reign opened with a vigorous campaign against heresy and immorality. The great and partially successful efforts, too, which he subsequently made for the reconquest of those portions of the empire that had fallen under the rule of the Northern

barbarians were in no small degree influenced by his pious desire for the spread of the true faith, and his ardor in the same cause initiated many successful missions to still unconverted peoples, both within and without the empire. His reign was destined to be one of the most glorious in history. The conquests of his two famous generals, Belisarius and Narses, who overthrew the Vandal and Gothic kingdoms in Africa and Italy; the remarkable work accomplished by his jurists; the magnificence of his constructions, chief among them the basilica of St. Sophia, are achievements almost any one of which would have given sufficient lustre to a reign.

Yet, unfortunately, there was another side to the picture. In the first place, the Emperor's passion for sumptuous edifices caused the greatest hardships to his people, who had to bear the cost. His predilection for theological controversy was still more fruitful of undesirable consequences; it has always been a rather difficult matter to convince royal theologians, who, from Constantine the Great to Henry VIII., have been only too ready to employ the argument of physical force when all other attempts to convince failed. However, in the year of our Lord 527 the prospects of the orthodox Christians seemed generally bright. The best of relations existed between Rome and Constantinople; only the previous year Pope John I., visiting the imperial city as ambassador of King Thedoric, had been received by the Emperor with the highest honors. At this time, too, Justinian fully acknowledged the distinction between civil and religious authority and regarded himself, in the character of Bishop-Exterior, as the executor of the Church's disciplinary laws. His recognition of the Pope's universal authority left nothing to be desired. Writing to Pope John II. (533-535), for instance, he speaks warmly of his devotion to the Apostolic See, as well as to His Holiness personally, whom, as is becoming, he esteems as a father. Everything that regards religion he hastens to bring to the notice of the Pope, and he has also seen to it that all the Eastern Bishops shall both be united with and subject to the Pope, who is the head of all the churches.[1]

Nor was this acknowledgment of the Pope's authority confined wholly, in the early part of Justinian's reign, to the sphere of theory; on at least one occasion the supreme jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome was asserted and admitted by the Emperor, in a case of great moment, in his own imperial capital. The circum-

[1] Reddentes honorem Apostolicae sedi et vestrae Sanctitati, quod semper in voto et fuit et est, et ut decet Patrem honorantes vestram beatitudinem: Omnia quae ad ecclesiarum statum pertinent festinavimus ad notitiam deferve vestrae Sanctitati. . . . Ideoque omnes sacerdotes universi orientalis tractus et subjicere et unire sedi vestrae sanctitatis properavimus. . . . quae caput est omnium SS. ecclesiarum. Cod. Justin., L. 8, I. 1.

stances were as follows: Shortly after his elevation to the Pontifical throne (535) Pope Agapetus was strongly urged by the Gothic King Theodahad to undertake in his behalf a mission to Constantinople. Though reluctant to do so, the Pope had really no choice in the matter, since the Gothic ruler had threatened that, should Agapetus refuse to intervene in his behalf with Justinian, Theodahad would order the execution of the Roman Senators, with their wives and children. Accordingly, the Pope set out for Constantinople, where he arrived early in the year 536.

The political errand of Agapetus met with no success, for the mind of Justinian was firmly set on the reconquest of Italy, which, as a matter of fact, the Pope and the Romans desired as ardently as the Emperor. But in the ecclesiastical order the visit of Agapetus to the East was destined to be of the greatest importance. The See of Constantinople was just then ruled by the Patriarch Anthimus, formerly Bishop of Trebizond, who, through the influence of the Empress Theodora, had recently been advanced to the episcopal throne of the capital. Anthimus, while pretending to be orthodox, was secretly a monophysite, to which circumstance he owed his favor with the Empress. When the Pope reached Constantinople these facts were made known to him by the orthodox clergy, with the result that he refused to communicate with Anthimus, first, because of the suspicion of heresy, and, secondly, because transfers from one see to another were strictly forbidden by the canons.

This attitude incurred the grave displeasure of Justinian, who endeavored by intimidation to bring Agapetus to his way of thinking. "Either comply with my request or I will cause thee to be carried away into banishment," he threatened. To which the Pope replied, "I who am but a sinner came with eager longing to gaze upon the most Christian Emperor Justinian. In his place I find a Diocletian, whose threats do not in the least terrify me." In justice to Justinian it must be said that up to this moment he had had no suspicion of the orthodoxy of Anthimus, so that when Agapetus suggested that the Patriarch should be questioned as to his belief, the Emperor without hesitation accepted the proposal. Anthimus was directed accordingly to appear before the Pope, who interrogated him on the subject of the two natures. His answers established his unorthodoxy, and in consequence he was deposed by the Pope and exiled by the Emperor. His successor, Mennas, was consecrated by Agapetus in the basilica of St. Mary.

In this striking manner did a Pope successfully assert his supreme authority over the Bishop of the imperial city, and his right

to do so was in the clearest terms admitted by one of the most arbitrary of the Roman emperors.[2] Within a month after the consecration of Mennas, however, the aged Pope died in Constantinople (April 22, 536), which event ended the satisfactory relations of the Church and the empire for the remainder of the reign of Justinian.

For the religious troubles of Justinian's reign no small share of responsibility rests on the shoulders of the Empress Theodora. Theodora was an ardent monophysite, who openly protected her co-religionists, in spite of the fact that the Emperor was carrying on a vigorous campaign against these sectaries. The deposition of her protegé, Anthimus, in the circumstances, by Pope Agapetus, caused her the utmost chagrin, but as Roman influence at this time was paramount in the capital,' for the moment she had to accept defeat. The death of the Pope, however, gave her the opportunity for which she waited, and with the unscrupulousness to be expected from one of her antecedents, she boldly resolved to secure the Papacy for the cause she so warmly espoused. Her plan was simple and, humanly speaking, likely to be effective; with the coöperation of Belisarius, then master of the Eternal City, she resolved to place in the chair of St. Peter a man devoid of scruples, who, in return for the great prize, would receive the monophysites into communion.

The person selected to carry out this project was the Roman deacon Vigilius, who at the death of Pope Agapetus held the office of Apocrisiarius, or Papal Nuncio, at the imperial court. Vigilius was the scion of a Senatorial family of Rome and son of a former Consul. He had long entertained the hope of ascending the Papal throne, and had nearly succeeded in attaining his wish some years earlier, when he had been solemnly designated by Boniface II. as his successor; Boniface himself had been designated in the same manner by Felix IV. But the indignation aroused among the Roman clergy by this second attempt of a Pope to nominate his successor became so pronounced that Boniface was compelled, before the Confession of St. Peter, to acknowledge that in this matter he had done wrong,[3] and, in presence of the clergy and Senate, to destroy the decree of nomination. After this humiliating check the chances of Vigilius of obtaining the object of his ambition by legitimate means became remote, but he still had influence enough to obtain the important office of Nuncio at Constantinople.

[2] Qui quidem dejectus est de sede hujus regiae urbis a sanctae et gloriosae memoriae Agapeto SS. ecclesiae antiquae Romae pontifice. Nov. 42. Praef.; Liber Pontificalis (ed. Duchesne) I. 288.

[3] Ipse Bonifatius papa reum se confessus est majestatis. Liber Pontif. I. 281.

Probably Theodora knew something of this episode in the previous history of Vigilius, or at all events she knew sufficient of the man to feel confident that if she could make him Pope he would carry out her wishes. A bargain was accordingly entered into between the Empress and the deacon, in which it was stipulated that if Vigilius should, with the help of Theodora, become the successor of Pope Agapetus, he in return would comply with all her demands in favor of the monophysites.

With letters for Belisarius containing the instructions of the Empress, Vigilius hurried to Italy, only to find on his arrival in Rome that the Papal chair was already occupied by the newly selected Pope Silverius. But Vigilius was not to be balked by this obstacle. A charge of treason was trumped up against Silverius; he was accused of having written a letter promising to open the Asinarian gate, near the Lateran, to the Goths, and as he refused to comply with the suggestion of Belisarius to do himself what Vigilius had promised the Empress, he was seized and carried into exile. A graphic account of the seizure of Silverius is given by the Liber Pontificalis. The Pope, who, at the time of this crisis in his life, lived at the Church of St. Sabina, on the Aventine, was invited to visit Belisarius in his palace on the Pincian, and, contrary to the advice of his friends, who warned him against the treacherous character of the Greeks, accepted the invitation. On his arrival at the palace the Pope was, first of all, separated from his attendants, and then, accompanied by Vigilius alone, he was ushered into the presence of Belisarius and his wife, Antonia. The latter, who was a close friend of Theodora, opened the tragicomedy, pretending to be indignant, with the query: "Tell us, Lord Pope Silverius, what have we done to thee and the Romans that thou shouldst wish to betray us into the hands of the Goths?" Before he could reply the Papal pallium was removed from the shoulders of Silverius, after which he was led into a private apartment and clothed in the garb of a monk. This done, the Sub-Deacon Sixtus went outside and announced to the waiting clergy that "the Lord Pope is deposed and made a monk." Silverius was then taken in charge by Vigilius and subsequently exiled to Patara, in Lycia.

When the exiled Pope reached his destination he was received with the greatest kindness and consideration by the Bishop of Patara, who also intervened in his behalf with Justinian. "Of the many kings who reign in the world," wrote the Bishop to the Emperor, "not one has suffered so cruel reverses as this man, who as Pope is over the whole Church." Justinian, who was probably unaware of the plot whereof Silverius was the victim, took imme-

diate cognizance of this appeal and gave instructions that the accusations against the Pope should be investigated. Nothing was really done, however, except that Silverius was, by order of Vigilius, removed from Patara to the desolate island of Palmaria, where he died, June 21, 538.

Silverius thus disposed of and Vigilius seated on the Papal throne, no further obstacle to the triumph of the monophysites seemed to remain. Curiously enough, however, Vigilius, now that the object of his ambition was attained, began to entertain scruples relative to the promises he had made the Empress. The chair of Peter appeared to have changed his character, and he remained deaf to the remonstrances of Belisarius relative to the carrying out of his agreement with Theodora. It is true, indeed, that a letter at this time was circulated, purporting to be addressed by Vigilius to the monophysite chiefs Anthimus, Severus and Theodosius, expressing views bordering on monophysitism. The authenticity of this document is, however, regarded as more than doubtful, whereas, on the other hand, the profession of faith sent by Vigilius to Mennas of Constantinople and the Emperor is rigidly orthodox. The author of the life of this Pope in the Liber Pontificalis even represents Vigilius as writing to the Empress emphatically declining to restore the deposed Anthimus, whom he stigmatizes as a heretic under anathema. He admits that formerly he spoke foolishly in this matter and that his actions have been inconsistent, but now he feels confident he is doing right, seeing that he is following in the footsteps of his holy predecessors, Apapetus and—Silverius!

Thus did the plan of the Empress for the moment completely fail of its purpose. But Theodora was not the sort of person to forget or pardon a slight. Years passed away, during which Vigilius remained undisturbed, a circumstance largely due, it is supposed, to the great influence exercised over Justinian by the Nuncio at Constantinople, the able Roman Deacon Pelagius. In this interval of comparative quiet Justinian was laboring zealously for orthodoxy and his wife with equal zeal and more success in the cause of heresy. The empire thus presented the curious spectacle of the Emperor strenuously endeavoring to extirpate monophysitism, while at the same time the Empress was employing every means at her disposal to frustrate his designs, going so far, even, as openly to protect and patronize the monophysite chiefs prescribed by her imperial consort.

Matters remained in this unsettled condition until the year 543, when an imprudent act of the Nuncio Pelagius precipitated a new religious conflict, the so-called "Three Chapters Controversy." To understand the origin of the Three Chapters question a resumé of the

antecedent facts bearing on the subject will here be necessary. In the early days of his nunciature, which began in 536, Pelagius, high in the favor of the Emperor, had set his mind to the difficult task of finding a way to bring back the Church of Alexandria to orthodoxy. The circumstances at this time seemed more than ordinarily favorable for an attempt of this nature, as the monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, Timothy IV., had just died. Two candidates for the succession were soon in the field—one, named Gainos, an extreme monophysite; the other, Theodosius, who, although an adherent of the heresy, was yet esteemed a person of moderate views and likely to prove amenable to reason. As the best means to the desired end, consequently, it was resolved at Constantinople that the candidacy of the latter should receive official support, and in due time Theodosius, to the accompaniment of a certain amount of rioting, was enthroned at Alexandria.

But Theodosius proved a disappointment, for when summoned to Constantinople two years later (538) and asked to accept the Council of Chalcedon, he declined to do so. The baffled Emperor thereupon sent him into exile. A more accommodating successor to the deposed Patriarch was then sought and found by Pelagius in the person of a monk of Egyptian origin named Paul, who was consecrated at Constantinople by the Patriarch Mennas. The new head of the Alexandrine Church arrived in Egypt in 540, with full powers to reëstablish orthodoxy.

But two years of violent rule exhausted the mandate of Paul, and his conduct became such that he was deposed by a synod held at Gaza in 542. Pelagius took the leading part in the proceedings of the synod, and once more the Papal Nuncio selected a Patriarch of Alexandria, his choice falling on a certain ecclesiastic named Zoilus.

But the voyage of Pelagius to Gaza was destined to produce other results of much greater moment than the choice of a Patriarch of Alexandria. "The journey to Gaza," says Mgr. Duchesne, "brought Pelagius into relations with the monks of Palestine, pious and orthodox personages, who, eager to find themselves at one on the question of the Incarnation, had sought and found another capital subject of debate in the doctrine of Origen. It was a God-send; on this question they were sure never to agree." At the date of the Synod of Gaza the pro-Origenists seem to have had the upper hand in this local controversy; whereupon the anti-Origenists, remembering that the great Alexandrian doctor had never been held in favor at Rome, approached Pelagius with a view to obtaining his influence in their behalf. The Nuncio became an easy victim, who, on his return to Constantinople, eagerly took up the

matter with the Emperor and the Patriarch Mennas. Justinian was always delighted with an opportunity of displaying his theological knowledge, and accordingly responded to the appeal from the Orient with a long edict, which concluded with the condemnation by the Imperial Pontiff of ten propositions taken from the writings of Origen. The Emperor further directed Mennas to hold a *sunodos endemousa* on the subject of Origen, and issued orders that in future all candidates for the offices of Bishop and Archimandrite should add a condemnation of the great Alexandrian to the anathemas already customary.

Pelagius, no doubt, congratulated himself on his success on this occasion, and seems to have forogtten that the Roman Church, which he represented, had more than once protested in strong terms against the usurpation by emperors of Papal prerogatives. But the Nuncio lived long enough to regret bitterly having raised again the Origenist question. For Origen had many and powerful friends in the Orient, who strongly resented the condemnation of their revered master, and only awaited a fitting occasion to repay the author of their momentary discomfiture. The most important of these pro-Origenists was the clever, and at court influential, Archbishop of Cæsarea, Theodore Askidas. For the time being, however, Theodore bent to the storm. He had no idea of becoming a martyr to his conviction, and consequently, when the Emperor condemned Origen, the Archbishop, with the usual Oriental facility in such matters, signed the condemnation. This done, he sought a means to turn the tables on Pelagius, and found what he sought, easily enough, in certain writings of three personages whose names had figured prominently in the Christological controversies of the previous century.

These three personages were Theodore of Mopsuestia, the teacher of Nestorius; Theodoret of Cyr, the friend and for a long time the ardent defender of the former Archbishop of Constantinople, and Ibas of Edessa. At the date of the Council of Chalcedon (451) the first of this trio was dead, but Theodoret and Ibas were alive and took part in the proceedings of the council, where they unhesitatingly condemned the teaching of Nestorius. Their orthodoxy being thus satisfactorily established, the colleagues at Chalcedon of Theodoret and Ibas tacitly agreed to drop all minor issues in their regard; whatever either of these Bishops might have said in the heat of controversy of a more or less compromising character was now, in the interest of harmony, forever committed to oblivion. But the moderate Bishops of Chalcedon had counted without the future Archbishop of Cæsarea, Theodore Askidas. Theodore's point of view was quite simple. If, he argued, so much is now

made by the official representative in the East of the Roman Church of the supposedly erroneous teaching of a great Christian apologist, who died three centuries ago, what about the errors of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the father of Nestorianism, and of Theodoret and Ibas, the opponents of St. Cyril, which were passed over by the legates of Pope Leo the Great at the Council of Chalcedon? Did not these also deserve to be anathematized, at least as much as Origen? Moreover, the Archbishop explained to the Emperor, it is precisely the exculpation of these three Bishops which is the greatest obstacle to unity; condemn them with their writings and the monophysites will return *en masse* to the communion of the Church.

The plausibility of this point of view appealed to Justinian, and, besides, the new opportunity presented to the imperial theologian for dogmatizing was irresistible; what a triumph for him should he succeed in closing the breach that for nearly a century had separated orthodox from monophysites. There was, indeed, an obstacle in the way in the fact that the Bishops whose reputations the Emperor now proposed to sacrifice had escaped censure and been restored to their sees by an œcumenical council. But the plan of Theodore Askidas did not contemplate any general condemnation of the trio in question; all that was necessary, he declared, was the disapproval of certain of their writings and the result aimed at would be attained.

This argument turned the scale with Justinian, whose desire for Christian unity grew more intense daily. Indeed, the situation in the Orient was really alarming, and was soon to become more so owing to the enormous success in establishing a distinctively monophysite Church, achieved a few years later by the famous organizer of the Jacobite denomination, James Baradeus. This remarkable man was consecrated Bishop of Edessa at Constantinople, in 543, by some refugee monophysite Bishops living in the capital under the protection of the Empress, and from this date to the end of his life all his energies were devoted to the monophysite cause. The result of his labors must have been highly satisfactory to his co-believers; in the decade following his elevation to the episcopate he established a schismatical Church, with twenty-five Bishops and more than 100,000 priests and deacons. These figures furnish abundant evidence of the futility of Justinian's plan of reconciling the monophysites, for his first edict condemning the Three Chapters was published in the year (543) of the consecration of Baradeus.

The term "Three Chapters," as first employed by the Emperor Justinian, referred to the three *capitula* or chapters in which his

decision on the subject was formulated. Subsequently, however, this phrase was transferred from the divisions of the edict to their object, namely, (1), the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia; (2), the writings of Theodoret in favor of Nestorius and against the Council of Ephesus, and, (3), the letter of Ibas to the Persian Bishop Maris. All of these persons or things were anathematized in 543 by the head of the Roman State, and thus was precipitated a new conflict in Christendom.

For the defenders of the Council of Chalcedon objected in the strongest terms to the opening anew of issues which, they maintained, the great council had definitely settled. It was, indeed, admitted by this party that the condemned writings contained much that was objectionable, and everybody knew that Theodore of Mopsuestia was the intellectual parent of Nestorianism. In 435, for example, Theodore had been denounced by Rabboula, Bishop of Edessa, and the justice of the denunciation was then recognized by St. Cyril of Alexandria and Proclus of Constantinople. Yet these two dignitaries refrained from anathematizing Theodore, for the reason that some of those who controverted his teaching did so from a monophysite standpoint, and thus objected to opinions of the Bishop of Mopsuestia, which were wholly orthodox. This confusion placed St. Cyril and Proclus in a dilemma, for whereas they were about to condemn Theodore as a Nestorian, they were now called upon to defend him against the monophysites. After due consideration and seeing that Theodore had long ago died in the communion of the Church, the two Patriarchs decided to take no action at all in the circumstances, and an edict of Theodosius II. recommended all parties to drop the subject.

As regards the two others concerned in the edict of Justinian, Theodoret and Ibas, they also, it was admitted, had said regrettable things. Theodoret had spoken harshly of St. Cyril, yet at Chalcedon he had subscribed the condemnation of Nestorius and was restored to his diocese. Ibas, too, had written in violent terms of St. Cyril, and certain portions of his letter to Maris were deserving of condemnation. But at the same time this very document contained proofs that Ibas was thoroughly orthodox in his belief, which fact being recognized by the fathers of Chalcedon, he also was restored to his see. Furthermore, Ibas had previously, at the Synod of Tyre, retracted all that was objectionable in his letter, and, subsequently, without hesitation, condemned Nestorius.

The objections of the orthodox, therefore, to the edict of Justinian were, in brief, that the Emperor was meddling with matters disposed of by an œcumenical council of the Church, whose decisions in this regard, and no matter what he might pretend to the

contrary, he was endeavoring to overthrow. But the Emperor was determined to have his own way, and having chosen his position, he began to employ all the powers absolutism placed at his disposal to compel the Bishops of Christendom to submit to his will.

The first to accept the edict was Mennas, Patriarch of Constantinople, though only on condition that, should the Pope refuse to approve, his signature should be regarded as withdrawn. The Patriarch of Alexandria, Zoilus, as well as Ephraim of Antioch and Peter of Jerusalem, at first protested and resisted, but finally yielded to the Emperor's command, before the threat of deposition. The Eastern Patriarchs thus won, the Bishops of their jurisdiction, with few exceptions, followed their example. Mennas of Constantinople, forgetting his own conditional signature, showed particular zeal in obtaining signatures, and went so far as to employ force with the Bishops of his patriarchate who exhibited any symptoms of opposition. The Papal Nuncio Stephen, successor of Pelagius, and the Archbishop of Milan, Datius, who just then happened to be in Constantinople, protested against the violent measures of the Patriarch. But their remonstrances passed unheeded, and in consequence the two Western dignitaries broke off relations with Mennas.

Having thus with comparatively little trouble succeeded in the East, Justinian next turned his attention to the West, where the real difficulty was to be anticipated. When the edict of condemnation reached Rome its purport was communicated by the Archdeacon Pelagius, the former Nuncio, to the Archbishop of Carthage, who was asked his opinion on the subject. The Archbishop's reply was one of unqualified disapproval; the general acceptance of the edict, he wrote, would be the end of the authority of œcumenical councils. This also was the unanimous opinion at Rome and throughout the West.

The Emperor, however, was not in the least moved by the opposition of the Latin Church, which he resolved to overcome. To attain this end, however, he must have the Pope on his side, and accordingly orders were issued that Vigilius should be sent, a prisoner if necessary, to Constantinople. According to the "Liber Pontificalis," it was really the Empress who was responsible for the seizure of Vigilius; evidently Theodora had not forgotten nor forgiven the failure of the man she had raised to the Pontifical throne several years earlier to fulfill his share of their discreditable compact.

At all events, "Anthemius the scribe" set out for Rome with instructions to arrest Vigilius anywhere, save in the basilica of

St. Peter, and to stimulate his zeal, Theodora, we are told, had sworn "by Him who liveth forever" that should he return without the Pope, the gentle Empress would have him flayed alive. When the officer arrived at his destination, November 22, 545, he found the city en fête celebrating the Pope's birthday. Vigilius, he learned, was just then in the basilica of St. Cæcilia, whither Anthemius hastened and, taking the Pope into custody, proceeded to the ship waiting in the Tiber, followed by a large concourse of weeping people, who asked the prayers of the illustrious prisoner. The moment the ship drew off from shore, however, the Pope's enemies in the crowd revealed their sentiments towards him, and with the courage born of certain impunity these brave Romans now hurled all manner of missiles and abuse after the latest and most highly placed ecclesiastical victim of imperial tyranny. Such was the first reward of the Roman Church for her fidelity to the idea of the Roman Empire. For some unknown reason Anthemius did not proceed directly to Constantinople with his prisoner, but disembarked at Catania, in Sicily, where the Pope was detained for the next ten months. Here Vigilius proved that among his failings was not a want of magnanimity; early in 546 he dispatched to Rome, then besieged by the Goths, a fleet of corn ships for the relief of the people, whose cry, "Hunger go with thee!" had rung in his ears at the time of his departure. At length, January 25, 547, he arrived in Constantinople and was received by the Emperor with all the honors due his position. This preliminary over, the serious business to be transacted between the Pope and the Emperor was introduced. At first Vigilius was very firm in his attitude, which was one of total opposition to the imperial edict; he even at this time excommunicated Mennas, together with the other Eastern Bishops who had accepted the Emperor's condemnation of the Three Chapters, for a period of four months; the Patriarch retorted by excommunicating the Pope for precisely the same period.

After this brave beginning Vigilius entered on the long course of vacillation which lasted until death (555) finally delivered him from the awful burden of the Pontificate he had so eagerly sought and assumed a decade previously. In the first place, the theologians of Constantinople were soon able to convince him that the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia were really and seriously, in certain respects, wanting in orthodoxy and that the condemned works of Theodoret and Ibas as well were, from the same point of view, the reverse of edifying. Yet at the same time the Pope was aware that the Council of Chalcedon, knowing as well as he the objectionable character of these writings, had refrained from condemning the so-called Three Chapters. How could he escape the dilemma in which

circumstances had placed him? After reflection Vigilius thought he saw a way out of the difficulty by means of a compromise, but he had sufficient sense of the dignity of his high office to reject the Emperor's demand for his subscription to the edict of condemnation. If needs must that he give way, then he will do so in a manner that will at least be in keeping with his position as head of the Universal Church. This decision was not at all pleasing to Justinian, but neither threats nor blandishments availed, and Vigilius had his way. After various consultations with the ecclesiastics of his suite the Pope, April 11, 548, pronounced judgment on the question at issue in his celebrated *Judicatum.* The two leading features of this document are (1) the condemnation of the Three Chapters, as the Emperor demanded, and (2) an emphatic reservation in favor of the decrees of the four œcumenical councils, particularly those of Chalcedon, and of his predecessors in the chair of St. Peter.[4]

In this way Vigilius thought he had solved the problem of satisfying both the Emperor and the West, but he soon found that his hopes in respect to the latter were ill founded. For the publication of the *Judicatum* was greeted with indignation or regret throughout Latin Christendom. In the entourage of the Pope at Constantinople Datius of Milan and Facundus of Hermiana were dissatisfied, and although at first the Roman members of his suite expressed themselves loudly in favor of the *Judicatum,* subsequently, when these prudent personages saw how the land lay at home, they were just as loud in its condemnation, thus causing Vigilius much trouble. His own nephew, the Deacon Rusticus, and another Roman deacon named Sebastian, took the lead in opposition to their chief, who was thus obliged to depose both of these disloyal attendants from office. A council held at Carthage in 550 was the most emphatic of all in its disapproval of his action, going so far even as to excommunicate him. The Bishops of Illyria and Dalmatia also formally declined to accept the decision of the Pope, while the Bishops of Gaul, as yet not fully aware of the facts, wrote, uneasily, asking for information and received the assurance that on his return to Rome Vigilius would explain everything satisfactorily.

In view of this serious resistance to the *Judicatum* the Pope and the Emperor agreed that it would be advisable to withdraw this unsatisfactory production and refer the question in dispute to the decision of an œcumenical council. The Emperor, however, before this determination had been acted upon, first took the precaution of obtaining from Vigilius a promise under oath that the Pope would aid him by every means in his power to have the

[4] *Cf.* Hefele-Leclereq, III., part I., p. 29.

Three Chapters anathematized. This proceeding showed plainly enough the use the Emperor intended to make of the proposed council; it was to be a convenient instrument to carry out his wishes; whereas the Pope, by the engagement entered into, completely deprived himself of all independence of action.

These preliminaries arranged, invitations for a general council, to be held in Constantinople, were issued. How little freedom of discussion the Emperor intended to grant the fathers was soon indicated when the delegates from Africa arrived in the capital. The Eastern Bishops, of course, gave Justinian no anxiety and the Bishops of Illyria refused to attend. But Africa sent four Bishops to represent its ecclesiastical provinces: Reparatus, Archbishop of Carthage; Firmus, Primate of Numidia, and two Bishops from Byzacene, Primasius and Verecundus. On the arrival of these prelates in Constantinople all manner of attentions was shown them, in the hope of winning them over by flattery to the court point of view. But when this method failed of results, intimidation was employed. The Archbishop of Carthage, on the false charge of having caused the death of an imperial general, was deposed and exiled and his place given to his own representative at Constantinople, Primosus. This object-lesson was not without its effect on the remaining African delegates, two of whom subsequently went over to the Emperor's party; Verecundus, Bishop of Junca, alone resisted to the end.

The bad faith of Justinian was still further shown by the next move of the court party. Fearing resistance on the part of the Western Bishops, should these in large numbers attend the council, the Emperor, by the advice of Theodore Askidas and contrary to his promise to the Pope, issued a second edict condemning the Three Chapters; after which began the ordinary procedure in such cases—a demand for episcopal signatures. Vigilius vigorously protested against this new outrage and held a conference of Eastern and Western Bishops at his residence, to determine what action should in the circumstances be taken. At the close of the conference the Pope demanded that the Emperor should withdraw his latest edict, which, Vigilius said, would scandalize the Latin Bishops more than ever and leave the council free to perform the task for which it was convened; he further asked that the Western Bishops should attend the council or at least be permitted to vote thereat by proxy. These demands were put in the form of an ultimatum, and at the same time those who had already subscribed to the edict were excommunicated. Datius of Milan also addressed the Emperor in the same sense. Speaking, he said, for Northern Italy, Gaul, Burgundy and Spain, he felt sure he could say that whosoever accepted

the imperial decree would be excluded from the communion of the Bishops of the countries named.

But Justinian and his chief adviser, Theodore Askidas, declined to grant the demands of the Pope. Theodore, indeed, by his own authority, struck from the diptychs the name of Zoilus of Alexandria and, in concert with Mennas, appointed a person named Appollinaris in his place; for these arbitrary acts Theodore was excommunicated. The situation was now critical, and, fearing for their safety, the Pope and the Archbishop of Milan sought refuge in the basilica of St. Peter (August, 551). Soon afterwards a decree of deposition was drawn up against Mennas, Theodore Askidas and their adherents, but as the Pope still hoped an understanding might be arrived at, this sentence was not published immediately. Justinian, however, had no intention of yielding; on the contrary, by his orders the basilica of St. Peter was invaded by a company of soldiers and an attempt made to arrest the Pope. Vigilius resisted, and being a man of powerful physique, took hold of a column of the altar, from which the soldiers, seizing him by the feet, the head and beard, were unable to dislodge him. In the struggle that followed the column became loose and the table of the altar would have fallen on the Pope had it not been held up by some of his attendants. The sight of this outrage was too much for the people who were spectators, and their attitude became so threatening that the Prætor, with his troops, thought it wise to retreat. Violence having thus failed, Justinian now resorted to the other Byzantine alternative—stratagem. An imposing delegation of courtiers, headed by Belisarius, was sent to reassure Vigilius and to promise him, under oath, that, if he would return to his former residence, his safety would be guaranteed. The Pope agreed and drew up at once an oath in this sense for the Emperor's signature. Justinian, however, refused to sign, but directed that his representatives should do so in his stead. Vigilius accepted this modification, and accordingly the imperial delegation took a solemn oath, on a relic of the True Cross, guaranteeing him liberty of action. Whereupon Vigilius returned with his followers to the Placidian palace.

But the spirit of the convention thus entered into was from the beginning violated by a system of petty persecution. The Pope's servants were corrupted; some even of his clerical attendants proved false and caused him great annoyance. Finally calumnious reports were industriously spread in the West against Vigilius and his fellow-prisoner, the Archbishop of Milan. A notary was even bribed to counterfeit letters, purporting to come from the Pope, which were forwarded to Italy, with the view to discredit their supposed author. Fortunately, at this juncture ambassadors of

Theodobald, King of the Franks, visited Constantinople, and to them was entrusted a letter to the Italian clergy, which contained the correct version of the Three Chapters controversy.

The Placidian palace thus became a prison, all appoarches to which were closely guarded. Two days before Christmas (551), however, the Pope succeeded in again effecting his escape, and this time he fled across the strait, where he found an asylum in the basilica of St. Euphemia, in which the Council of Chalcedon had been held a century before. The place of refuge was well chosen, since it strikingly brought home to the popular mind the fact that the Pope was being persecuted because of his fidelity to the great council. The sentence of deposition drawn up six months earlier against Mennas and Theodore Askidas was now published (January, 552). So far as Vigilius was concerned personally, his second asylum was respected, but the Archdeacon and former Nuncio, Pelagius, who had joined his chief at Constantinople, was, with the Deacon Tullianus and several Bishops, dragged off to prison; Verecundus, the African Bishop, who had remained true to the orthodox cause, died in St. Euphemia of the hardships to which he had long been subjected. About a month after the Pope had found a secure defeat at Chalcedon the Emperor again made advances, and Belisarius, with the same delegation who had so solemnly sworn that the Pope's liberty would be respected, again visited Vigilius. But the Pope had had enough of Byzantine oaths and declined a second time to fall in with the imperial wishes. Whereupon Justinian addressed to Vigilius a letter so full of threats and abuse that he was even ashamed to sign his name to the precious document! The Pope replied, February 5, 552, in an encyclical letter to the Catholic world, in which he gave a detailed account of the brutal treatment he had received at the hands of the Emperor and his satellites, lay and clerical. The encyclical also contained a profession of faith, and, in order to offset any bad impression that might have been created by the calumnious reports circulated against him, a clear recognition of the four œcumenical councils. This vigorous action of the Pope, together with the excommunication of Mennas and Theodore Askidas, at once produced a wholesome effect. Moreover, at this date Rome was in the hands of the Gothic King Totila, a fact wholly favorable to the interests of Vigilius, since it rendered an attempt to dispose of him in the manner in which he himself, with imperial assistance, had got rid of his predecessor, out of the question. Negotiations between the contending parties were accordingly resumed, and a profession of faith, entirely satisfactory, was sent to the Pope by Mennas and Theodore. These personages further assured Vigilius that they

anxiously desired the restoration of peace in the Church; that they accepted the four œcumenical councils without reservation, as well as the tome of Pope Leo; and finally they protested their freedom from complicity in the persecutions the Pope had suffered and asked pardon for having held intercourse with excommunicated persons. The Pope accepted these explanations and professions, after which he returned from Chalcedon to Constantinople.

The rest of the year 552 dragged along without anything definite being done towards the settlement of the tedious controversy. In the course of the year the Archbishop of Milan died at Constantinople and Mennas was also called to his reward; the latter was succeeded by the Patriarch Eutychius. The question of a council was again raised and Vigilius consented to its convocation, on condition, however, that the Latin episcopate should be well represented and that it should be held in Italy or Sicily. But the Emperor held out for Constantinople and an overwhelming majority of Eastern Bishops, whereupon the Pope refused his coöperation. Justinian next proposed submitting the issue to a small body of Bishops, composed of an equal number from each party. Vigilius agreed to this, on condition that half the arbitrators should be Latins. But this was not at all the Emperor's idea; he demanded that each of the five Patriarchates should be equally represented, and thus the Latins would be outnumbered four to one. Vigilius naturally refused to accept such a proposal and negotiations were again broken off.

At length the Council of Constantinople opened, May 5, 553, under the presidency of the Patriarch Eutychius; the Pope refused in any way to participate in its discussions. The Emperor, however, did not yet give up all hope of winning over Vigilius, and accordingly, even while the council was in session, repeated efforts were made by the Bishops and the Emperor to induce him to join them. But Vigilius had at last taken a firm stand, and while the council was engaged in carrying out the wishes of Justinian, the Pope was busily occupied in formulating, with the assistance of his Western advisers, his own definite decision on the Three Chapters controversy. This decision was published in Constantinople May 15, 553, with the signatures attached of the Pope, sixteen Western Bishops and three of the Roman clergy. This important pronouncement, known as the *Constitutum,* opens with the statement that its author had carefully examined all the documents bearing on the question and was now in consequence in a position to deal with it on its merits. The position the Pope takes is quite consistent with the attitude of his predecessors and of the council of Chalcedon. It would, of course, he believed, have been much better had the

present issue never been raised. The Council of Chalcedon was perfectly well aware of the objectionable things in the incriminated writings, yet, in the interest of harmony, the fathers of that assemblage had refrained from condemning a man who long ago had died in communion with the Church, and had, moreover, restored to their churches Theodoret and Ibas, after receiving satisfactory assurances that both these Bishops were orthodox in their belief.

Now, however, since so great importance is attached to issues that should have been left in oblivion, Vigilius takes up the Three Chapters, over which the imperial theologians have set the whole Christian world by the ears, and renders judgment on each separately. As regards Theodore, in the first place, the Pope agrees with the Emperor and his advisers that the writings of this personage contain much that deserves censure, and accordingly he condemns some sixty propositions extracted from his works. But he declines to anathematize the *person* of the former Bishop of Mopsuestia, on the ground that such a condemnation was against all Roman precedent. The Council of Ephesus, says the Pope, condemned a profession of faith attributed to Theodore, as charged with error, but refrained from condemning Theodore himself. This moderation was imitated by the Council of Chalcedon. Moreover, two predecessors of Vigilius, Gelasius and Leo, had expressly pronounced against condemnations of the dead. These Popes, Vigilius declares, had decreed that the dead should be left to the judgment of God; therefore, he, following the example thus laid down, will neither condemn nor permit to be condemned a man who died in communion with the Church.

As to Theodoret of Cyr, Vigilius fails to understand why so great efforts have been made to dishonor the memory of a Bishop who had at Chalcedon established his orthodoxy and had besides condemned Nestorianism in terms accepted as satisfactory by the six hundred or more fathers of that council. Nor will it do to say in excuse for the procedure now advocated by the Emperor that the Council of Chalcedon would never have approved of the harsh things said by Theodoret against the anathematisms of St. Cyril. At Chalcedon Theodoret had accepted the *doctrine* of St. Cyril, which was the important matter, and the fathers of Chalcedon, following in this the magnanimity of St. Cyril himself, had allowed the question of his writings to remain at rest. Nevertheless, since the question of erroneous doctrine supposed to have been taught by Theodoret has been raised, and since writings of this character are passing round under the name of Theodoret, Vigilius condemns these writings. But he does not and will not condemn Theodoret.

The same principle held for the case of Ibas of Edessa. The

profession of faith presented by Ibas at Chalcedon was pronounced orthodox by such men as the Papal legates, Anatolius of Constantinople and Maximus of Antioch, and the judgment of these leaders was accepted by the council as its own. Of course, it went without saying that the council had not approved the attacks of Ibas upon St. Cyril, but as a matter of fact Ibas had himself expressed regret for having said in the heat of controversy unwarranted things of the former Patriarch of Alexandria. Which being the case, no further action is now necessary as regards Ibas; his letter was accepted and his person respected by the Council of Chalcedon; this must suffice, declares Vigilius, for all Catholics. The *Constitutum* concludes with a prohibition to all ecclesiastics against writing or teaching anything in contradiction with this decision of the Roman Pontiff.

Justinian, however, refused to receive the *Constitutum,* on the ground that if it condemned the Three Chapters it was unnecessary, seeing that Vigilius in his *Judicatum* had already condemned them; whereas, on the other hand, if he now modified his former judgment, he condemned himself. The Emperor then sent directions to the council that the name of the Pope should be stricken from the dipytchs, which order was, of course, obeyed by the subservient Eastern episcopate. In their eighth session this assembly proceeded to carry out the remaining wish of the Emperor and anathematized the Three Chapters, "that is to say, the impious Theodore of Mopsuestia and his blasphemous books; also whatever of an impious character has been written by Theodoret and the blasphemous letter attributed to Ibas; we anathematize them as well as those who defend them, who regard the Three Chapters as orthodox, and who wish to cover their impiety with the authority of the holy fathers and of the Council of Chalcedon."

For seven months Vigilius declined to approve the acts of the Council of Constantinople, which time he spent in exile, in the island of Proconnessus. Then, suffering intensely as he did from a most painful disease, he yielded to the Emperor's will and gave the required approval. After further examination of the question, he finally wrote, and, following the example of St. Augustine, he had now made up his mind to acknowledge his mistakes. He therefore anathematized and condemned the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, as well as what Theodoret of Cyr had written against the orthodox faith and St. Cyril and the impious letter attributed to Ibas of Edessa.

Vigilius survived this last act of weakness less than a year and died at Syracuse, on his return journey to Rome, June 7, 455. Of course, in reality there was no contradiction between the Council

of Chalcedon and the Council of Constantinople; whereas, the decision of the latter was identical with the *Constitutum,* save in the matter of the condemnation of *persons* as well as writings. The former council had said nothing at all about Theodore of Mopsuestia, and in the view of their acceptance of the faith of Chalcedon, had refrained from expressing any disapproval of the polemical works of Theodoret and Ibas. But the Emperor, rejoicing in his discovery that the molehill ignored by six hundred Bishops was a veritable theological mountain, insisted, with all the obstinacy of a pedant, on condemning the so-called "Three Chapters." True, he expected great results from this condemnation, but such an expectation only proved how little he knew of the monophysites; the only result of his ill advised, tyrannical activity in this tedious controversy was to alienate the West without in the least conciliating the East. As for the Pope, in his stronger and better moments he had manfully resisted the efforts made by the Emperor to force him to perform acts which, no matter what might be said to the contrary, were a reflection on the Council of Chalcedon. For the position assumed by Justinian tacitly implied that the secular head of the empire was a better judge of what was expedient in this case than an assembly of the Bishops of Christendom. The fault of the second Council of Constantinople, as well as of Vigilius, in approving its decisions lay, primarily, in its indirect admission that such a view was justified. There was no question of contradictory pronouncements by two general councils, but merely a question as to whether it was better to ignore with Chalcedon or to take cognizance of and condemn, under imperial pressure, with Constantinople.

Thus once again did a Roman emperor succeed in imposing his will on the Eastern Church and at the same time in introducing confusion and schism in the West. How much longer would Christendom submit to the arbitrary interference in its internal concerns of these Eastern Cæsars? The history of the Church in the next century and a half was to answer this question very clearly and decisively.

Maurice M. Hassett.

Harrisburg, Pa.

THE PAPAL SWISS GUARDS.

THOIWALDSEN'S colossal statue of "The Dying Lion," which is hewn into the solid stone side of a mountain at Lucern, is a classic symbol and monument of the courage and loyalty of a mountaineer people who have had to struggle constantly with a nature which is nowhere else in the world surpassed in beauty and grandeur. The sublime Alpland seems to have been made by the Creator as the impregnable fortress and citadel of liberty in Europe. True it is that for hundreds of years this small people have been able to keep the pearl of liberty at its own high and unpurchasable price in the very face of grasping and bargaining neighbors. The familiarity with mountain pass and untrodden forest, the constant danger of a visit from an uninvited invader, the very hardship of existence have made this people the best and most valiant defenders of liberty. No country that ever sought to throw off the yoke of oppression or repel the encroachments of an enemy ever turned in vain to Switzerland for help. Because mere existence there is a schooling in hardship severer than any military life imparts, we find that every man is a born warrior or early turned into one. Though the Swiss army has always been insignificant and never worth counting as far as numbers are concerned, and though military service has never been required for more than three months in years of peace, yet we can scarcely name an army of Europe, during the late Middle Ages, which has not had a good sprinkling of these sturdy and experienced warriors.

If the Swiss are conservative—and it could not be otherwise with a people who live in the shadow of the eternal hills—they have also been tenacious of the faith. Indeed many did fall away from Rome to accept the stern rigorism of Calvin, which seems to come naturally to this people of sturdy, rugged and prosaic temper. But those who remained loyal and faithful to the See of Peter have given the most glorious example of devotion to the successor of the Fisherman King. Truth to tell, the Swiss are, perhaps, one of the most religious people of Europe. Not without reason did Dumas call them a "nation of sacristans." If it is true that few converts to Rome have ever been made in Switzerland since the Reformation, then, on the other hand, we must admit that few Catholics have ever been converted to the philosophy of life which can satisfy religious yearnings by aught else than the most whole-hearted devotion to the Church. There are few half-hearted, indifferent Catholics in Switzerland. Perhaps in no land do we find a more pious

body of men. The Swiss may have a narrow outlook upon the world. But they only look upward when seeking the Spouse of Christ. Hence they are Petrine to the core. And in all history there cannot be found a more consistent and persistent loyalty to the temporal claims of the Pope than that which they have shown. During four centuries the Papal Swiss Guards have tried to do for the Vicar of Christ what they have tried to do for every oppressed nation because they succeeded in doing it for themselves —to obtain and maintain liberty and freedom despite the greatest obstacles from within and without. No other nation has shed so much blood for Rome on the battlefield, none other has sacrificed itself so generously, unsparingly and gladly for the temporal prestige of the Holy See. The Swiss to a man desires liberty for himself with a passion that borders very near on fanaticism. And because he knows from experience the blessed utilities and advantages of freedom, he does not hesitate one moment in staking everything to obtain it for him who needs it most and has the strongest claims on it, the Pope of Rome, the Fisherman King of the Vatican Hill. The Swiss speaks little—perhaps a blessing and mercy for sensitive ears—but he does great things naturally and easily with an iron determination and eagle quickness.

To the eternal shame of our legion of Catholic historians it must be said that the surpassingly inspiriting story of the Papal Swiss Guards has, so far, been almost left untold by them. If it is true that Dame History has, in these latter days, been baptized with the waters of Catholic science, then this neglect is nothing else than a culpable sin of omission or else the more heinous sin of criminal indifference. No doubt in every history of the Papacy which aims at anything like fullness the mention of Swiss warriors must frequently appear. But this passing mention is not sufficient. For the fair country hid away in the Alps did not send a few warriors at rare and intermittent intervals to assist the Popes in maintaining their temporal sovereignty and independence. During four centuries the little land, which sorely stood in need of every strong arm and stout heart of its own and could dispense with its own soldiers only at a great risk to its own safety and a greater danger of becoming involved in political quarrels with the enemies of the Pope, during four centuries and more Switzerland maintained a regularly organized and equipped body of soldiers at Rome. In times of peace as also of war they were at the Pope's disposition. It is this systematic and organized assistance given to the Holy Father by Catholic Switzerland which merits recognition at the hands of historians. "In times of war all men are soldiers," Tertullian somewhere says, "and every warrior who does his duty fully deserves

an honorable mention. Now most victorious generals sooner or later obtain a biography or else a paragraph in the story of the great battles of the world." But it is the soldier of the rank and file of the army, without whom no general could win his laurels, who should be remembered by the historian, who must be generous in his praise to all, if he is to be considered just and fair-minded. For generosity and valor no army ever surpassed the Papal Swiss Guards who have been volunteers from the beginning. The soberest historian will feel his soul swell with admiration when studying the history of this Papal army.

This history of the Swiss Guards of the Pope calls for a really superior savant. The Papal Guards must be separated from a miscellaneous army of men in the Pope's service for a mention apart, as being, par excellence, the Pope's regular troops. A man who cannot keep the Swiss Guards distinct from the occasional warriors on the side of the Pope; who cannot understand that, as the regular bodyguard of the Holy Father, they were the leaders who bore the brunt of the conflict and attack and shared the fate of the battle with the Father of Christendom, be it in flight, captivity or taxation; who cannot picture for himself the worry and anxiety amongst the soldiers who had to cast about on all sides for means to recruit their thinned ranks from a country which was always sparsely populated; a man who cannot understand and take into account these and a score of other like circumstances which make the history of the Papal Guards a history apart and by itself closely bound up with the temporal vicissitudes of the Holy See, a short-sighted man had better not undertake the long-deferred labor which bristles with difficulties of all sorts. But the very difficulties of the task ought to invite some historian of talent, patience and courage to tell a story which would prove so sweet and entrancing to many a Catholic ear that is still ringing with the tragedy of the loss of the Papal temporal power. Perhaps, too, the remembrance of the glorious achievements and still more glorious devotion of the Swiss Guards would give us courage to hope for and strive for the restoration of those States and that independence for which they gladly bled in nearly every corner of Italy during more than four hundred years.

The history of the Papal Swiss Guards as an organized and distinct part of the army of the Popes dates from the year 1505. The creation, organization and equipment of a standing army for the protection of the Pope's person and the defense of the Patrimony of St. Peter was the glorious achievement of that mighty, indomitable military genius, Julius II. When he succeeded Pius III. on the Pontifical throne on November 1, 1503, the internal and

external conditions of the Papal States were in a very sorry plight. For scores of years every rapacious ruler of the many petty States of Italy, whose ambitions were larger than his lands, had taken his turn at cutting off for himself appreciable parts of the Papal domains. The shortsighted political policies of several of Pope Julius' predecessors, especially Alexander VI., had almost dynamited the independence of the Holy See. Julius II., with that energy which Michael Angelo wrote upon every limb and muscle of his colossal "Moses," which is nothing else than an idealized statue of this Pope on whose tomb it was intended to figure, with that quickness, resolve and resourcefulness which would have made him the conquering leader of any handful of men, cast about on all sides for allies to continue a holy war—a crusade indeed, not in the distant Orient as of old, but on the very fields of sacred Italy —a war against the enemies of God because they were the enemies of Christ's Spouse, the Holy Church. Whilst still Cardinal Julius della Rovere, the Pope had had ample opportunity to see for himself the dauntless valor of the Swiss soldiers. As commendatory Bishop of Lausanne from 1472 to 1476 he had seen with his own eyes that these peasants went off to war as to a banquet. They were undoubtedly the best free lances of Europe. Besides, the Pope had had frequent intercourse with Peter de Herenstein, canon of Sion, Beromünster, Basel and Constance, who had carried through at Rome many delicate missions and charges of his fatherland. Herenstein had warrior's blood in his veins, being the son of the hero of Morat, Caspar de Herenstein. At the Diet of Zürich on September 5, 1505, he obtained permission to raise an army of two hundred men for the immediate defense of the Pope. Shortly afterwards Caspar de Silinen marched towards the Eternal City at the head of this troop of picked Swiss soldiers.

This first colonel captain—for the head of the Papal Guard, like the leader of the Swiss army, has never assumed the pompous title of general—was born in 1474. His father, Alban de Silinen, was one of the leading warriors at the battles of Morat, Verene and Netstal. With his father, Caspar had fought on the side of the French in the Neapolitan campaign. He was a man of great courage and enthusiasm—every inch a soldier. He sought to give play to his unbounded love for the Church and its head by the practice of arms—for he loved war as the very breath of his nostrils. At his word many of his countrymen rallied under the Papal banner, without, however, obtaining beforehand the permission of the heads of the cantons. This first Papal Swiss army fought bravely in the campaign which won back for the Pope in the year 1505 the fair and important cities of Perugia, Bologna, Ravenna, Faenza, Cervia,

Imola, Cesena and Rimini. Encouraged by these successes, the Pope now determined on recapturing the other leading Italian cities which Venice had snatched from Cæsar Borgia, to the great chagrin and danger of the Roman See. The better to realize the plan which he had not hesitated to divulge to the Venetian Ambassador, Pisani, the Pope entered the League of Cambrai on December 10, 1508. Thus the Pope of Rome joined hands with the kings of France, Austria and Spain and the dukes of Savoy, Ferrarra, Mantua and Urbino against the common foe of Italian peace and security, the Venetians. Through his intermediary, Matthias Schinner, whom he had raised to the Sacred College of Cardinals in September of that same year, Julius II. made an appeal for troops to the entire Swiss Confederation. At Aguadello, on May 14, 1509, Venice was completely beaten and at one stroke lost all her precious possessions in the peninsula. The proud warriors of the Adriatic city desired earnestly to be reconciled with the Pope. For in those bloody days men might have the courage, when intoxicated with war, to brave the anger of the Father of Christendom. But no vanquished enemy was hardy enough to sulk at the forgiving Father's knee. Hence on February 24, 1510, five ambassadors from Venice, with Mocenigo at their head, knelt humbly on the steps of the Vatican basilica to beg the everlasting pardon of the Pope as he was carried by on his ebony chair. Julius II. was great in war, but he surpassed himself in peace and a spirit of dignified forgiving. Assisted by twelve Cardinals and surrounded with his faithful Swiss Guards, he ordered the Miserere to be chanted. At each verse of this cry for pardon he touched the shoulders of one of the ambassadors with a golden sceptre. Then the Venetians were conducted to their quarters amid the jubilant shouts of approval of the Roman people. It was a typically mediæval scene, perhaps the last of its kind in the history of the world, a scene when stern justice and sweet forgiveness were seen to have been meted out by the Father of all Christendom in a right kingly and picturesque manner.

The Pope now dreamed of clearing Italy of the French armies, which in his need he had been constrained to call upon for help against the Venetians. Cardinal Schinner, who was a diplomat of the finest type and enjoyed an immense popularity in his native land, where he occupied the See of Sion, entered into fresh negotiations with the Helvetian States. At Lucern he succeeded in closing a treaty with the cantons on February 26, 1510, which was to last five years. In August of the same year six thousand men passed in review before him at Martigny before setting out for Rome. But this army was forced to disband in the passes which lead over the Alps, because discord had broken out amongst its

leaders. The devotion of the private soldiers to the cause of the Holy Father remained strong and burning despite the pettiness of the leaders. For in October, 1511, at the instigation of Ulrich Hoenig, of Schwyz, ten thousand men, for the most part from the cantons of Bern, Fribourg and Soleure, banded themselves together in a new Papal army. At Lugano another eight thousand men from the remaining cantons of the Confederation joined them. But once more the leaders of the troops proved unfaithful. For they were bought over by the money of the French to promise, on the pretext of the bitterness of the winter season, not to proceed beyond the walls of Milan. Gaston de Foix assimilated and incorporated a great part of these disbanded troops into his own army, and on April 11, 1512, after having chastised Brescia for its unfaithfulness and supineness to his cause, won a brilliant victory over the Ravennese troops. But De Foix fell, mortally wounded, in this engagement, together with many more of the leaders of the army. Thus one of the most formidable armies which ever marched against the Eternal City was definitively removed from the field.

Nothing daunted by this repeated infidelity of the Swiss leaders, Julius II. again sent Cardinal Schinner to the Diet of the Helvetian Confederation to plead the formation of another army. On May 6, 1512, the cantons agreed to send help to the Pope. Twenty thousand soldiers met at Coire, crossed the Engaddine, where they were joined by a large contingent of troops from the Swiss Oberland; arrived at Trent, where the Bishop, George de Niedek, received the leaders in a really princely fashion. Here the army encamped for some days, because the welcome everywhere manifested was unfeignedly genuine. Ulrich, of Hohensac, was chosen captain general of all the troops; James Stapfer, of Zürich, colonel of the infantry, and John de Lanthen-Heid, of Fribourg, commander of the artillery. At Verona Cardinal Schinner joined the troops. He assured them of the early arrival of the Papal and Venetian armies. From the hands of this Prince of the Church each soldier received his pay, whilst the head of the armies received a banner of red silk adorned with pearls in the shape of a dove representing the Holy Ghost, as also a precious sword encrusted with pearls. These were the gifts of the Pope to his fighting men. Panting for battle, the troops marched from Verona to Villafranca, where they were joined by ten thousand Venetians under the command of Paul Baglione. By way of Valeggio, Cremona and Pavia the army reached Milan, where on the last day of the year 1512 Maximilian Sforza received its leaders and representatives of each battalion in his own palace, and gave them for headquarters his own fortified castles at Lugano, Locarno, Valeggio and Mendrizio. The Swiss

troops remained in the environs for the forthcoming coronation ceremonies of the Duke of Milan.

Julius II. was delighted beyond words with the glorious victories which these troops everywhere reported. Every opposition being, as was every form of military defense in the Italy of that day, of a small though at times very troublesome nature, every obstacle to the victorious progress of this army of the Pope faded away like thin smoke before the onmarching cohorts. The Holy Father knew full well that the enthusiasm for his person, which reigned in this miscellaneous army that swept on victoriously through Italy, was engendered by the ardor of the Swiss soldiers, who to valor and daring unspeakable joined the most contagious and infectious loyalty to the Holy See. Enthusiasm was a better cement in such a varied mass of men than the most rigid military discipline. Hence in the fullness of his joy he ratified on July 3, 1512, the brief which had been drawn up on the twenty-second day of the preceding June, in which the title of "Defensores libertatis Ecclesiæ" had been conferred in perpetuity upon the Swiss. This is by far the most glorious title which has ever been given by the Pope to an entire people. Kings in the past had, no doubt, merited from the Pope honorific titles for one reason or another. But in this case the entire Confederation received a name of distinction from the Supreme Pontiff, a name which is as eloquent of the Pope's appreciation as it is of a people's devotion to the best and most legitimate cause. Even yet the Swiss Catholics glory in this title of four hundred years ago; and they have never forfeited their right to it by withdrawing their sympathy and support from the successors of him who gave it first to their forefathers. This title is still current in Papal diplomatics. Over and above this, the Pope gave the army two gorgeous banners embroidered with the cross and the Papal coat-of-arms. To each canton of the Confederation a banner in silk was sent, on which the figure of the local patron saint was stitched in gold. The Pope himself gathered his warriors about him in the Vatican basilica and offered up a Mass of thanksgiving to God for the victory of Ravenna. Raphael has immortalized this very memorable event in a sketch for a tapestry. Julius II., moreover, extended to the Diet of the Swiss Confederation an invitation to send ambassadors to the Eternal City to discuss with the Father of Christendom the political interests of the Church Universal. Caspar de Silinen, colonel captain of the Papal Guards, proceeded as far as Florence to meet the Deputies of the Diet. He carried with him gorgeous court dresses in silk and embroidery, lest the vivacious and carping courtiers of Rome hold up to innocent ridicule and jest these sturdy mountaineer people with their simple

Swiss dress. As soon as the party reached the walls of the Eternal City it was met by the Roman nobility, and, to the booming of cannon and the music of countless bands, was led through the streets of the city, which were groaning with a dense crowd of grateful people, who wept and cheered for their delight and welcome. The Holy Father himself begged to be carried to a spot whence he might see the pageant and bless the loyal-hearted representatives of the faithful cantons. Some days later the Pope, surrounded by his Cardinals, received them in a private conference. Lienhardt Grieb, of Basel, read a Latin address of thanks to the Pope in the name of the cantons who had sent him to represent them in the council of the First Man of Christendom. Never, perhaps, has a glorious warrior been more gloriously welcomed in the proud old city by the tawny Tiber. A few weeks later, Peter Falk, of Fribourg; John Erlach, of Bern, and James Stafileo moved on to Venice to arrange a permanent treaty of peace between the City of the Popes and the City of the Doges. The year 1512 was a golden one in the military annals of Switzerland—for Switzerland proved itself capable of helping to realize, in an eminent way, the grandiose schemes of a mighty man who sought liberty for the Spouse of Christ as the best means of giving free play to her passion for beneficent activity. Julius II. was fully aware, as he himself said more than once, that God had His own plans and designs with regard to the temporal mission and vicissitudes of His Church. What he, however, could never bring himself to see or allow was that the Papal States should be the target for every band of petty warriors. If the Church was to be enslaved it must be done by none other than a race of Napoleons. But men of Napoleonic courage and daring came from the distant mountain country of the Alps and ranged themselves on the side of the Pope. And hence the giant Della Rovere Pope was right in bestowing on these a name which they well deserved and merited. Julius, however, was not to enjoy long the independence which he had vindicated for the Papal kingdom. On February 21, 1513, he passed away, and, on his own wish, was buried in the humble Church of San Pietro, in Vincoli, where he had so often repaired during his Papal career, to pray with uplifted hands, like Moses, for victory on his arms. His reign will ever be memorable in so far as it marks a period of victory and upward motion in all departments of the Church's life. He scotched the serpent of schism when he did away with the canonically irregular convention of Pisa; he drove the gloating and painted barbarians beyond the Alps; the omnipresent money-lenders and usurers who held more than one damning bond against the Papal exchequer, he sent off contentedly, with

bursting purses and money bags, without, however, having done any damage to the financial status of his throne; he dealt out well-merited punishments on the enemies of peace and order who were the enemies of his Holy See, and best of all, he won back liberty, independence and prestige for the Church at the cost of much sweat and labor and prayer. These and other temporal blessings for the Church were to become the mere baubles which that extravagant patron of verse-makers and word-brokers, the second Medicean Pope, Leo X., squandered right and left without thought during his reign over the Fisherman's kingdom.

Leo X. on ascending the Papal throne on March 13, 1513, did not dispense with the services of the Swiss Guards, which numbered two hundred, under the command of Caspar Silinen. One of his first acts in their regard was to arm them with lances, which, though picturesque and ornamental, were not by any means so serviceable in actual conflict as the swords they had so far made use of. Leo X. also commanded Michael Angelo to design a uniform for his guards. This consisted of a doublet and short breeches in red, yellow and green, with a black velvet cap, adorned with a white plume for officers and colored plumes for the soldiers. Later on details of this uniform were changed to satisfy the tastes of subsequent ages. But in its general design and colors it has remained the same until our day. The pay of the soldiers was fixed at four gold crowns per month. A uniform and small accessories were given to each soldier annually.

The political policies of the Pope were greatly furthered by the victory over the French at Novarro on June 6, 1513, in which the Swiss played a noble and preponderating part. In the year 1514 Leo X. entered into a treaty with the Confederation by the stipulations of which he was authorized to raise troops in all the cantons in times of war. The Pope, on his part, agreed to pay annually to each canton the sum of two thousand gold florins. Francis I., who had meanwhile succeeded to the throne, inherited all the boundless ambitions of his predecessor, Louis XII. He at once began to gather an army of thirty-five thousand men, with whom he hoped to regain the Duchy of Milan, which Julius II. had placed in the hands of his liegeman, the Sforza. On September 4, 1515, the Swiss were sorely beaten at Marignano after a sharp encounter which had lasted two days. In haste they fled for shelter and protection to Milan, carrying their cannons on their shoulders and their wounded comrades in the centre of their decimated ranks. Though the pride of the French battalions was much wounded by the great losses which they had sustained at the hands of an army which was two-thirds smaller than their own in numbers,

Francis I., with a show of power which was little less than burlesque, had himself proclaimed "chevalier" by Bayard, the "chevalier sans peur et sans reproche." The Swiss were constrained against their will to come to terms with the victors, and with the best grace which they could muster entered into a treaty of perpetual friendship with the French. The Pope, eleven days later, on December 10, 1516, made a concordat with Francis whereby he was able to keep for himself the ecclesiastical revenues and annates which he always stood in need of to satisfy the rapacity of the hordes of worldly-minded literati who now moved about freely in the Vatican palaces. The Pope, on his part, relinquished his claims to Parma and Piacenza in favor of the French king, to whom he also granted the right of episcopal and abbatial nominations in France. The Swiss were deeply scandalized at the extravagance of the Pope in favor of the literati at a time when every soldo was needed for purposes of war, and the recent defeat had greatly cooled their enthusiasm for a Pope who had not only taken the disgrace of Marignano lightly and cool-bloodedly, but immediately began to pursue a course of political flirtations with untried and unknown allies. And just at the same hour the Reformers began to preach strange doctrines throughout the North, which were either not understood or else not heeded at Rome. Discontent was rife. And the Pope, like a true Medici, only sought to quell the murmurs of the hour by fair words which no one believed or trusted, or by granting privileges to certain classes which did an infinite hurt to the feelings of long tried friends. Thus the agent of the Canton of Zürich at Rome did not hesitate to remind the Pope that he was sadly in arrears with his pay for the soldiers and his annual grant to the canton. Nearly all the Swiss cantons took it ill when Lucern was given the exclusive right to choose the captain colonel of the Papal troops without so much as having heard the wish of the other districts. At the Diet of Baden in June, 1517, it was admitted and proclaimed on all sides that the Pope had annulled his agreement with the cantons. But all dissatisfaction came visibly to the surface, like a rash, when Leo X., true nepotist that he was, handed over the Duchy of Urbino to his nephew, Lorenzo de Medici, after having deposed Francesco della Rovere, nephew of Julius II., for felony and the murder of a Cardinal. Hence when Caspar de Silinen sought permission from the cantonal authorities to raise an army of three thousand Swiss soldiers to repel the advance march of Della Rovere, he met with little success and less enthusiasm. Despite the positive prohibitions of the head of the cantons, Caspar succeeded in gathering together a troop of about two thousand volunteers. With these he marched against Della Rovere, whose

troops had been augmented in the meantime by the troops of Spain. At Rimini, whilst they were in camp expecting no attack, the Pontifical troops, of which the Swiss formed the head, were surrounded by eight thousand Spaniards. A veritable massacre went on. The Swiss fought bravely, like tigers, but finally succumbed to the greater numbers of the adversary. Caspar de Silinen fell, and with him fell one of the bravest warriors and staunchest friends of the Holy See. He was buried at Silinen on August 26, 1517, with all the honors of war. The Dominican John Faber pronounced the funeral oration, which was later on edited, for the third time, by Oswald Myconius. From this interesting eulogy and panegyric, which contains many bits of personal information about the illustrious dead warrior, we can learn the deep piety and boundless charity to the poor of this first leader of the Papal Swiss Guards, as also the great qualities of mind and heart which the rough schooling of the camp and battlefield only brought to the light more prominently. He was indeed an ideal Christian warrior—a Crusader of the Pope—truth to tell, a Papal Tancred, without a Tancred's Gallic madness and shortsightedness.

The post of captain colonel was provisionally filled by Silinen's brother, Christopher. Bartholomew Berwaeger, of Appenzell, desired ardently to receive the appointment to this post and tried many means to obtain it. This goes far to show that it was a charge of distinction. But the Pope saw the pressing need of conciliating to himself the Canton of Zürich and of binding it by every possible band to the Holy See, because the new doctrines were making rapid progress there amongst the people. Hence the Bishop of Veroli and Apostolic Delegate to Switzerland, Ennodius Philonardus, offered the command of the army to the Mayor of Zürich, Marc Roüist, who accepted it, after much hesitation, with the consent of the cantonal authorities. In his chagrin and disappointment Berwaeger embraced the new doctrines in 1522. Owing to his advanced age, Roüist handed over the active command of the Papal Guards to his son Caspar.

Peace seemed to have descended at last upon Italy. Leo X., however, made use of this short breathing space to try to realize his dreams of finally putting down another enemy of the temporal power of the Holy See, Alphonsus d'Este. The Pope still looked for help to Switzerland. Hence Pucci, Bishop of Pistoia, hastened thither in the hope of gathering an army of six thousand men. Captain Göldi and Louis Erlach, who were at the head of the two divisions of the army, obtained free passage through Lombardy from the French king, who was leaving nothing undone to come to the terms of a treaty with the Swiss. The leaders of the Swiss

army were invited by the Pope to come for a brief consultation. The Pope received them with unfeigned affection, whilst the Roman people welcomed them with joy. Gifts of great value were heaped upon them and the soldiers. The Pope communicated to them his earnest desire of subduing and keeping in subjection the restless and dangerous Duke of Ferrara, which these faithful soldiers set about doing at once by taking from him the strongly garrisoned fortresses of San Felice and Finale. Marching out from their camp near Ancona the Swiss troops next hoped to capture Faenza. But the populace cast its lot with the Duke, and after a slight skirmish in the large piazza before the Duomo, the Swiss were allowed to withdraw freely, after having promised the podestá to abstain from further attempts at seizing the town.

In the meantime Maximilian had died, and three candidates presented themselves for the imperial crown. These were Henry VIII. of England, Francis I. of France and Charles V. of Austria, King of Spain, to whom the Swiss were favorably disposed. France succeeded in winning the support of twelve of the Swiss cantons and their allies for all measures save that of its imperial aspirations to the German crown. Now, the French, after a light encounter at Faenza, made an assault on Reggio, which was occupied by Italian troops. Leo X. took occasion of this to ally himself with Charles V., and was thereby forced to attempt to drive the French out of Italy, where these were continually extending their power and possessions. The Bishop of Veroli at once hastened to the Diet of Lucern, which was sitting, to ask for an army of ten thousand men. This demand was put off for later consideration by the Swiss, who were still mindful of their treaty with France. Zürich, which had refused to join the French treaty of May 17, 1521, raised an army of two thousand men, under the command of George Bergner. Seven hundred nondescript warriors from other cantons joined this army later on as the picked bodyguard of Cardinal Schinner, who had meanwhile joined the troops in order the better to rouse their enthusiasm for the Pope's cause. Another body of volunteers from the whole of Switzerland, numbering in all about six thousand men, rallied to the side of the Pope. Thus the Papal army of Swiss soldiers numbered about twenty thousand men, under the command of Prospero Colonna. He, with a small detachment of soldiers, besieged Reggio, whilst the remaining troops encamped near Medolé, whence Parma and Piacenza could always be kept in eye. Bergner avoided an open conflict with the French; but when these latter left Milan he hastened on towards Parma. But when, on December 1, 1515, Leo X. died, the Swiss troops begged for permission to return to their homes, since, they urged, with the death of the Pope,

their oath of allegiance to the cause of the Holy See was irretrievably broken. Thus ended the military relations of the Holy See with the ensemble of Swiss cantons. The Reformation, which was spreading rapidly throughout Switzerland, was, by its very nature, inclined to render the intercourse of these two old friends ever more and more strained.

Leo X. was succeeded on the Pontifical throne by Florence, of Utrecht, a former tutor of Charles V., who as the rigid and reforming Adrian VI. had little occasion, in his short reign, to show special marks of his confidence in the Swiss Guards. His Medicean successor, Clement VII., had much to thank the Swiss Guard for. For Italy had become again the common battlefield of Europe. The Swiss defended the interests of the Pope bravely at Bicoque, Sesia and Pavia, which were nothing else than last pangs of a military campaign inaugurated by Leo X. In order to draw back peace to the distracted country, the Pope, who as a Medici bore an innate antipathy to the French, was willing to open negotiations for an armistice. He professed himself willing to grant the Duchy of Milan to the son of Francis I., although this latter was a captive. The French king, on regaining his freedom, entered willingly, with Venice, Milan and Tuscany, into a league which the Pope had planned and carried through successfully at Cognac on May 22, 1526. The Swiss Confederation also joined the league, and James Tragen, of Ury, raised an army of eight thousand men, which was placed under the command of Claude of Savoy, Count of Tende. The leading Swiss lieutenants were Anthony Erlach, James de May, William Hirenstein and Francis Armbruster. Half of the troops marched upon Milan by way of Lugano, without having so much as espied a foe on the way. The other half of the army set out directly for Rome. Intercepted on the way by Anthony de Leyva and Caspar Frondenberg, the Swiss lost more than eight hundred men.

In June of the year 1526 Charles de Bourbon threw his ragged and impoverished armies upon Lombardy in the hope of obtaining by pillage and plunder the pay of his soldiers, which was greatly in arrears. Milan, after a slight resistance, had to submit to the most systematic kind of pillage at the hands of these starving soldiers. The safety of Rome was threatened, and in fear Clement VII. closed a treaty with Launoy, Vice-King of Naples. On the advice of Moncade, Ambassador of Spain, he promised to pay eight thousand ducats to the King if he would promise to withdraw his troops from the Papal domains. But just on account of the insufficient fortification of Rome, Prospero Colonna, who had in the meantime turned against the Pope, swooped down with eight thou-

sand peasants on the Transtevere quarters of the city. The Pope, who had none of his Swiss Guards at hand, was driven to take refuge in the Castle of San Angelo. During an entire year the sack of Lombardy by Charles V. went on with unrelenting persistence and cruelty. And when the Protestant peasants of the Tyrol heard of the ample booty that was to be had easily in Italy they rallied in great numbers under the banner of George Frondenberg, a savage man, who marched at the head of his troops wearing a gold chain about his neck with which he would strangle the Pope, he boasted. Charles V. and Leyva joined their troops to this horde of infuriated rabble. The social offal of Italy naturally associated itself with this mass of ruffians. This army of men, if the name of army is not too dignified a title for all that was worst in European society, marched by way of Ferrara and Bologna towards Rome, having given up the original route through Tuscany in order the earlier to seize their victim, who was none other than the Father of Christendom himself. The Duke of Urbino swelled the onmarching horde in order thus to revenge himself upon the Medici who had deprived him of his duchy. On May 5, 1527, Bourbon, with his newly worn allies, appeared before the walls of the Eternal City. The number of these banditti was put down by a contemporary writer at forty thousand. Frondenberg never saw Rome, for he had died on the way from a stroke of apoplexy, brought on, so it was said, by a life of drunkenness and debauchery. On the eve of the 6th of May the first assault was made upon the walls of the city. Bourbon was shot whilst leading an assault upon the gate of Santo Spirito. Knowing that his end was come, he begged his adjutant to cover up his body with his mantle, lest the soldiers, seeing his fate, might give up the fight and let slip their golden opportunity of revenge and pillage. Philibert, last of the princes of Orange of the house of Chalons, took the command, and in the bloodiest of the fray showed the soldiers the dead body of their leader, inciting them thus to merciless revenge. The soldiers succeeded in breaking through the city walls about 2 o'clock in the morning and marched directly upon the recently completed basilica of St. Peter. Here they were met by a handful of Swiss soldiers, two hundred and fifty all told, who fought with indomitable courage until nearly every one of their number had fallen. Amongst the slain was Roüst, the captain colonel of the Papal Guards. Eight hundred of the enemy were mowed down beside the entrenchments which had been hastily thrown up around the Vatican precincts. The Pope had time to retreat, by means of a secret passage, to the Castle of San Angelo with the forty soldiers who had survived the assault. With an unspeakable bloodthirstiness the invaders put

more than seven thousand Romans to death in less than twenty-four hours. Then they began to pillage the Eternal City in a right savage manner. The sacred vessels of the sanctuary were carried from the churches; altars were turned into banquet tables, around which a drunken soldiery, vested in the vestments of the Most High, danced in wildest frenzy. The soldiers then convened a mock conclave, declared the Pope deposed and elected in his place one of their number, whom they called by the very significant name of Pope Luther. This better than anything gives the clue to the whole spirit and temper of the invasion. The sack of the city by Alaric, or any other chief of his kind, was not more cruel, profane and sacrilegious than this one by a horde of men, most of whom had been baptized into the Church in their infancy. Clement VII. capitulated on June 5 with thirteen of his Cardinals and agreed to remain in prison until a sum of forty thousand ducats had been paid. He ceded Parma, Piacenza and Modena to the Germans, Ravenna to Venice and the Duchies of Urbino and Ferrara to the dukes who bore the names. Hardly had this horde of men disappeared from the city when an invasion of the French was threatened. But this calamity was averted by the Pope, who entered into a treaty with the Spaniards, who soon drove out of Italy the bandits of Froudsberg by means of an army under the command of Napoleon Orsini. The Pope entered into his own States with the assurance of permanent peace, as a result of the treaty of Barcelona (June 29, 1529), whereby Charles V. won the crown of Naples and the royal consecration as King of Italy.

The Swiss Papal Guards who survived these fatal months were so few in number and the services which they were enabled to render the Holy See were so insignificant that scarcely any official news of their good offices and vicissitudes, save perhaps the record of the death of the more prominent amongst them, has come down to us. But Clement VII. had seen for himself the loyalty of this people, and hence he strained every nerve to continue in friendly relations with the cantons. He was willing not to insist too much on religious differences so long as Switzerland would continue to furnish the soldiers of whom he stood much in need. On May 7, 1531, he tried to placate the cantonal authorities of Zürich, where the Reformation had taken a strong hold on the people, by reimbursing their treasury for the pensions which had been appropriated by an untrustworthy agent. Only with his death on September 15, 1534, did Clement VII. break with the Swiss.

As soon as Alexander Farnese had taken possession of the Papal throne on October 13, 1534, as Paul III., he turned his eyes affectionately upon the Swiss. He took it as a good omen to find soldiers

of the Protestant cantons of Zürich and Bern in the ranks of the Papal army, and through their mediation he tried, by every means and as many as he could, to maintain the friendly relations of the long gone Catholic past. Thus, with a daring at which we now can only wonder, he called upon the entire Swiss country for soldiers to conduct a crusade against the Turks, who were beginning, with fresh courage, to creep up over the fair provinces of Europe. Again, when he summoned the Council of Trent, the Pope invited the cantons to join in the work by assuring the meetings of the assembled fathers military protection and safety. His letters to the authorities were couched in terms of such paternal persuasiveness and trust that the Protestant leaders found it right hard to turn a deaf ear to his appeals and invitations. Only after he had learned that the Protestant cantons were hopelessly hostile to the Holy See for doctrinal reasons did he turn himself, in especially intimate condescension, to the Canton of Lucern, which had already shown itself the stronghold of Catholicism in the Confederation. The devotion to the See of Peter of all the men of the canton and the energy and valor of its magistrates won for them from the Pope a renewed confirmation of the title "Defenders of Papal Liberty." In a Brief of December 20, 1542, Paul III. praised them for their loyalty and devotion, and in an unintentional confidence he remarked that these warriors enjoyed his entire trust. He proved this in a very tangible manner by reorganizing the status of the Papal Swiss Guards. The recent wars, with their deplorable results to the prestige and finances of the Holy See, required an entirely new ordering of the Papal army. A detachment of 250 Swiss warriors, commanded by a colonel and a lieutenant, was reserved for the protection of the Pope's person. Though the Papal exchequer was in sore straits, the Pope pensioned munificently all the veterans of the recent wars whose services were no longer needed. This new corps of Papal Guards had its own court and enjoyed all the privileges, emoluments and exemptions of the company of one hundred Swiss lancers in the employ of France. Each soldier received the monthly pay of four gold crowns and two uniforms per year. In times of war or actual attendance upon the Holy Father the daily wages were increased. The Pope assigned them a barracks close to St. Peter's, near to the Porta Torrioni, and supplied arms, ammunition, fire, light and rations. Discharge from service must be preceded by a notice three months in advance, and the expenses of each man's home journey to Switzerland were defrayed by the Pope. The rate of pensions for veterans was not altered. The salary of the captain was six hundred crowns per year. The original uniform was retained. The flag of the regiment

was the Papal standard, with an additional cross and keys in gold embroidered on either side. Jost von Maggen, a native of Lucern, of whom mention will be made later, was appointed colonel captain of the reorganized Guards. Caspar Silinen, son of the hero of Rimini, and generally known as Caspar II., was chosen captain; Jost Segesser de Baldegg was appointed lieutenant. An appeal was made to the Canton of Zürich to assist in recruiting the necessary number of soldiers. But the Protestants of the canton refused with courtesy, even regret, if we interpret aright their letter of February 9, 1548, published by Lutolf. In the month of March, 1548, a small troop, mostly composed of men from the Canton of Lucern, set out for Rome, headed by a banner which the brave Hans Hammerer bore aloft nearly all the way.

As the bodily safety of the Papal Legates at Bologna and Ravenna was, in those days of war and riot, constantly in danger, the Pope determined to create a guard for them after the model of that of Rome. Hence the Catholic cantons of Switzerland acceded to the Pope's desire and sent two detachments of soldiers of one hundred and fifty men each to protect the Papal representatives in the north of Italy. Later on the number of soldiers was reduced to fifty, under the command of a lieutenant. Peregrin Beroldingen was appointed the first lieutenant of the Bolognese Guards by a Brief of Julius III. on December 22, 1552. Four years later he resigned his post in order to join the forces of Henry II. The command passed into the hands of the baronial family of Arnoldi, of Spiringen, in which it ever remained till 1740. The family of Bessler de Wattingen held the command from 1740 till the French invasion of the Papal States. The Ravennese Guards were recruited solely from the Canton of Schwyz, though the captains were always chosen from the Tanner family, who resided in Ury. The era of partition and subdivision of the Papal Guards did not end with the sixteenth century. Early in the seventeenth century a corps of fifty Swiss soldiers was constituted for the protection of Ancona. Unterwalden at first furnished the men, but from the year 1660 the Canton of Ury attended to the recruiting of the small regiment. Clement IX., in 1668, created another small guard of fifty men for the protection of the Papal Legate at Ferrara. These men were drawn from the Canton of Zoug, and were commanded by members of the Brandenberg family up to the hour of the dissolution of the corps during the French invasion.

This dividing of the numerical strength of the Papal Guards—dictated as it was, in the first instance, by financial reasons—tended to dissipate the enthusiasm of the Swiss volunteers of the Church. But brave warriors and towering military geniuses were to be found

at all times in all or some of the small bodies of Papal soldiers. Chief amongst these was Jost von Meggen, the first captain colonel of the Roman division of the Papal Swiss Guards. He was the son of Werner von Meggen, an old and tried warrior who had fought against the Suabians and later on won distinction in the campaigns of Cappel. The youth received a very thorough education, and with his friend, Gily Tschudi, was one of the favorite pupils of the famous master Gladeanus. In 1525 he undertook an extended tour of Italy and France, adding a very complete knowledge of the languages of those countries to the tongues he had already mastered—Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Spanish, Portuguese and several of the Slav languages. On his return he married Appollonia von Hutter, from which union no issue sprang. He was elected member of the National Council on Christmas Day, 1530, and during ten years (1537-1547) administered the affairs of Weggis, Baden, Beromünster and Willison. In 1542 he made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and on September 3 was created Knight of the Holy Sepulchre. Visiting Syria, Egypt, Turkey and Sicily on his return journey, he arrived at Rome on April 8, 1543, where he left a manuscript account of his travels, which was published after his death at Dillingen in 1580. The affairs of the Diocese of Constance called him to Rome in 1546. Julius III. recognized in him a profound politician and an able diplomat, and in his capacity as colonel captain of the Papal Guards, Von Meggen played a large part in the religious and political relations of the Holy See with Switzerland. His fatherland entrusted him with the delicate post of Agent to the Holy See, and the archives of Lucern contain many records of his activity. He took an active part in the preparatory labors of the Council of Trent. These countless labors did not hinder him from carrying out the details of the reorganization of the Papal Guards. His first endeavor was to carefully sort out the men whose duty it was to guard the person of the Pope. His ideals were lofty, and the requirements he looked for in a Papal soldier were deep piety, courage, valor and an unblemished life. Whosoever was found wanting in any of these points was forthwith dismissed from service. It is no wonder, therefore, that after a few months' command of the Guards, Von Meggen was pleased to hear from the lips of the Pope that these soldiers were the admiration and boast of the entire Pontifical court. Hence in 1556 the sturdy colonel received from the Pope honorary citizenship of the city of Rome. When Von Meggen's faithful support, the Ensign Ulrich Hankratt, died on October 15, 1549, his place was filled by Philip Russen, who soon won the affection of all men by his good conduct and distinction of manners. He rendered silent

but valuable services to the head of the Guards at a very critical time.

For Cardinal Caraffa in ascending the Pontifical throne as Paul IV. on May 23, 1555, did not on that account put aside his deep antipathy for the French. This brought about a passing misunderstanding between himself and his colonel captain, whose sympathies were all that way. This was tantamount to saying that Von Meggen bore no great friendship for the Pope's favorites—the Spaniards and Austrians. For the same reason he could not rouse himself to great enthusiasm for the Colonna whom the Pope favored, because they had set themselves against the growing influence of the French in the peninsula. The Guise and Caraffa partisans had sworn to oust the French at all odds from Italy. Antonio Caraffa was named commander of the Swiss soldiers in 1555, and a year later was made Marquis of Montebello. About the same time the Pope instituted a noble guard composed of 100 Roman patricians, whose duty it was to accompany the Pope as a mounted guard whenever he rode forth from the city. The Pope also tried to draw closer together the warring cities of Ferrara and Venice, hoping thus to win them to his side. In secret he began preparations for war against the Spaniards, which when they heard, they forthwith made an alliance with Henry II. There was nothing for the Pope to do, according to the military ethics of the day, than to labor at the dissolution of this armistice by playing off one against the other and to win the assurance of support of the Swiss. He set about at once doing this. Deputations from the cantons were invited to Rome to felicitate the Pope on his recent elevation to the Fisherman's throne. The Catholic cantons of Fribourg, Soleure and Appenzell acceded with pleasure to the Pope's invitation. Fleckenstein, of Lucern; Beroldingen, of Ury; Schorno, of Schwyz; Schönbrunner, of Zoug, and Lussy, of Unterwalden, were chosen as the representatives of Catholic Switzerland for the occasion. At Milan they were joined by the Deputies of the Grison League, John de Florin and Captain A'Marca. Their journey to the heart-city of Christendom resembled a triumphal procession. For the Pope had given orders and money to the keepers of hostelries along the route to treat these ambassadors in kingly fashion. Von Meggen was dispatched to Bologna to escort them to Rome. Thirty Cardinals came out of the city gates to receive them, supported by the Roman nobility and one thousand mounted soldiers. All the bells of the city rang in joyous welcome; two hundred cannon boomed from the Castle of San Angelo. Campanas, a professional orator of Rome, presented them to the Holy Father in a speech containing these words: "It is their ardent desire to share the good or evil fortune

of the Roman Church." John Francesco answered briefly in the name of the Pope: "Pious and brave nation, you merit more than the name of defenders of the faith; you are the advance guard of the Church. Beloved sons, receive the kiss of eternal peace and the assurance of our support." These ambassadors remained in Rome for seven months, which were months of uninterrupted feasting and rejoicing for them. All were created Roman knights, and finally departed laden down with gifts of gold. But on reaching their native land the ambassadors were surprised to learn that the Pope had addressed himself to their country for an army of soldiers to undertake a campaign against Philip II. of Spain. The Papal Legate Ruerta, accompanied by Caspar Silinen, of the Ravennese division of the Papal Guards, had begged Tschudi to submit the Pope's request to the Diet of Baden, which was to convene on February 11, 1557. Tschudi consulted a pious warrior, turned hermit, Scheuber by name, as to the course of action which he should adopt. The hermit dissuaded him from the step, and the Diet subsequently refused the demand. Melchior Lussy, despite the earnest warning of Scheuber, gathered a troop of three hundred men and arrived at Rome in July, 1557. The city was in the hands of the god of war. The Swiss Guard kept close to the Pope in order to save him from the hands of the Colonna, who were ravaging the Campagna, which stretches on all sides around the Eternal City. The Pontifical army directed its chief blows at the fortress of Paliano, which lay on the frontier of the Papal States, because the mother, wife and sisters of Marc Anthony Colonna had taken refuge there. On July 26, 1557, nearly four thousand Papal soldiers, under the command of Antonio Caraffa, were driven back to Segni by the Austrians. Later on an attack was made upon the Pope's soldiers by the Spaniards. Three-fourths of the Papal army was annihilated; five Papal banners were carried off as trophies; the surviving soldiers were led off to captivity, from which they were released in consideration of great sums of money. Thus Tanner had to pay three hundred crowns, Caspar Silinen and Schönbrunner one hundred and twenty crowns each. Lussy escaped to Rome, which he entered, says the chronicler, "full of thoughts of Scheuber's warning." And the pious hermit died at the same hour, exclaiming: "Behold a sad hour for our countrymen at Rome!" This victory of the Spaniards at St. Quentin ended the war definitely, and the Swiss warriors who still remained betook themselves to their homes. The whole campaign is pathetic to look upon, for it shows forth clearly how little earthly princes are to be depended upon! On September 8 of that same year Cardinals Caraffa, Santa Fiore and Viteletto, accompanied by Jost von Meggen, journeyed to

Palestrina to conclude peace with the Duke of Alba. On the thirteenth day of the same month Von Meggen thanked his Swiss comrades for their services in the war and gave each man three crowns to accomplish the return journey to Switzerland. On the 19th of the month peace was made with Philip II. by Cardinal Caraffa and with the King of France by Cardinal Trivulcio. Jost von Meggen died shortly afterwards at Lucern, where he had been called to settle family business. Caspar Silinen III., captain of the Ravennese division of the Papal Guards, was chosen on March 17, 1559, as his successor. Just five months and one day later the new colonel captain had to give orders to his men to keep the night vigils by the bier of the Pope. On Christmas Day of the same year Rome was in rejoicing at the coronation of Cardinal Medici as Pope Pius IV. He set about at once to reform abuses in the Church and to introduce a greater simplicity at the Papal court. Lussy was delegated by the Catholic cantons to felicitate the Pope, in their name, on his election. At the same time he begged the Holy Father to take pity on Switzerland by appointing a protector in the person of the Cardinal Archbishop of Milan, St. Charles Borromeo. This appointment resulted in much good for the Church in the Helvetic lands. The Papal Guards under the new regime introduced by the Pope found little occasion to render more than ornamental service. We find few notices of the Swiss Guards during this time. In April, 1561, the personnel of the army was as follows:

Colonel captain, Caspar Silinen III.; lieutenant, Hans Schinner, of Valais; ensign, Jost de Mettenwyl; judge, James Bazenhofer, of Lucern; sergeants, William Thilman and Bernard Kopp.

On September 20, 1564, the list of officers was as follows:

Colonel captain, Caspar Silinen III.; lieutenant, James Marquart, of Sargans; ensign, Bernard Kopp; judge, William Henneberg, of Lucern; secretary, James Eberli.

The fact that on the death of Caspar Silinen III. on July 16, 1564—who was the last of his race—several candidates for the post of colonel captain came forward goes far to prove that it was looked upon as one worth having. The chief candidates were James Marquart, William Thilman and Gabriel Serbelloni, who was the son of the general of the Pontifical troops. Intrigues were even rife amongst the soldiers, who had split themselves up into cliques the better thus to promote the claims of their respective candidates. Lucern, which had long since proved itself the stronghold of Catholicism in Switzerland, insisted strongly on its inalienable right to propose a candidate for the post chosen from amongst the volunteers of the canton. The Pope, in the past, had recognized

this claim in words if not always in deed. The Lucern contingent of soldiers, which was by far the greatest of any canton, also urged that this right of presenting a candidate had been a condition laid down in the promise made to the Pope of opening a recruiting office on their soil at the time of the Council of Trent. The cantons of Ury, Schwyz, Zoug and Unterwalden supported the claims of Lucern. When the Pope saw that Lucern was in real earnest and did not mean on any account to relinquish its pretensions, he authorized the cantonal Grand Council to appoint a commander of the Papal Guards. The choice fell upon Jost von Segesser, Lord of Baldegg and a close relative of Jost von Meggen. On March 4, 1566, the new colonel captain was presented to the Pope and the Roman gonfaloniere, Hannibal de Hohenems, who both received him with great courtesy. Marquart and Thilman, in chagrin and disappointment, asked for their discharge, and Hans Hammerer, who had been one of the leaders of discontent, was expelled for bad conduct.

During a long period of twenty-seven years Von Segesser served the Holy See in many positions of trust. He held his commission as colonel captain of the Papal Swiss Guards during the Pontificates of Paul IV., Pius V., Gregory XIII., Sixtus V. and Urban VII. This is by far the best proof of his worth and efficiency. He displayed an even more embracing activity than did his uncle, Von Meggen, before him. In 1571 he rendered such conspicuous assistance to Walter de Roel, the Ambassador of five Swiss cantons to the Holy See, that he received a public and official letter of thanks from the authorities on May 22, 1572. In this letter he was also asked to present Lussy to the Pope. The Swiss captain had been sent to Rome to extend the expression of satisfaction of the cantons to the Holy Father for Segesser's valuable help. His voluminous correspondence, which is still preserved in the archives of Lucern, shows that he took a large part in various Papal negotiations of a political kind with Spain, Poland, Moravia, Florence, Venice, Portugal, France and the Orient. He was the soul of all reforms in Switzerland. To name but a few, we find him engaged in promulgating and having enforced the decrees of the Tridentine Council, in fostering the disciplinary reform of the clergy, in the foundation of institutes of higher education, in the calling of the Jesuits to Lucern and the Capuchins to several cantons, in the founding of a seminary in the Italian district of the Confederation, in collecting money for burses for Swiss students in the seminary of Milan, in the creation of a vicariate apostolic at Constance for the five Catholic cantons, in the erection of a Papal Nunciature in Switzerland in 1579, in bringing about the formation

of the Golden League, or the Borromeo League as it is called, in 1587. Besides these negotiations which made for a modus vivendi of the Church in a land that had grown inimical, in large part, to the Holy See, we find him busily engaged in purely state matters at Geneva, Neuchâtel and Valtelline. These duties often necessitated his absence from Rome. Lussy, by alleging this as a pretext, tried to have himself installed as colonel captain of the Papal Guards. But Von Segesser was too highly valued by the Pope to be dispensed with. He died, worn out by labors for Church and fatherland, at Florence on July 8, 1592, and his burial was magnificent. With Von Segesser disappeared one of the most loyal and tireless workers of the cause of the Holy See. His name is still held in benediction—and this causes us to wonder all the more that no worthy and complete biography of the man has been written.

Segesser was beside himself with joy when the news went forth that Cardinal Alexandria was chosen as successor to Paul IV. The newly elected took the name of Pius V. The choice was especially agreeable to the Swiss, for whilst still an humble friar preacher the Pope had shown great interest in Switzerland at Como, where he was Inquisitor. No one dreamed that this quiet, unassuming and peace-loving man was destined to win an imperishable name as a Papal warrior—second only to Julius II. But in 1570 Selim II., who had come to the throne of the Sultans through blood, snatched the island of Cyprus from the Venetians. It was a bold step and one that boded no good for Christendom. For the spot had a strategic importance for the Turks which no one could gainsay. Selim was now in close and dangerous proximity to the European mainland—and he dreamed of bringing it under the rule of the leathern apron. Pius V. saw the danger at once and called upon the Christian world to drive back the Mussulman, who was stealing upon Europe like a bloodthirsty beast. The Pope brought about a coalition of the Christian soldiers of the Papal States, Spain, Malta, Venice and the several minor republics of Italy against the countless warriors of the East. Germany, France, England and Poland refused to join in the crusade. Segesser was sent to Switzerland, and especially to Lucern and Valais, to gather an army of soldiers for the proposed campaign. He met with no success at the Diet, before which he pleaded the cause with much earnestness and enthusiasm. The assembled legislators refused to listen to him after several of his speeches. They adduced vague and flimsy and illusive pretexts against his motion. He therefore turned directly to the men of his own canton, and succeeded in gathering a fairly large troop of soldiers. These were incorporated in the army of the Pope. The first expedition against the Turks mis-

carried owing to dissension amongst the leaders. The Pope then entrusted the command of all the troops to Don Juan, of Austria. On September 16, 1571, he took command of the combined fleet, and after three days of fasting and prayer, lifted anchor. The Swiss Guards, as we learn from the monumental "History of the Papal Navy in the Middle Ages," by Padre Gugliemotti, O. P., sailed with Don Juan on the flagship of the fleet. They fought bravely and well, though poorly protected by their cuirasses. The Christian fleet was composed of three hundred vessels and eighty thousand men, of whom thirty thousand were armed for battle. The Mussulman fleet was made up of two hundred and fifty vessels, with one hundred and twenty thousand warriors, under the command of Ali Pasha. The battle began about noon on October 7; all afternoon the battle went on. At 5 P. M. the victory was won! Twenty-five thousand infidels had fallen; five thousand were taken prisoners; twelve thousand Christian captives were delivered from slavery; one hundred and thirty vessels fell into the hands of the victors—the others were destroyed. Only one Swiss soldier fell during the entire engagement. Another Swiss, Henry Roelli, of Kriens, distinguished himself by snatching two banners from the flagship of the Turkish fleet, which he carried in triumph to Rome. But the victory was not won by arms alone. Pius V. knew that "more things are wrought by prayer than this world lists of," and his favorite prayer was the Rosary of the Blessed Virgin, which he never tired of saying, because he was a Dominican. This superb victory is, with justice, ascribed to the intercession of the Rosary Queen, and St. Pius V., the Pope of the Rosary, instituted the feast of the Most Holy Rosary to commemorate the gratitude of Christendom towards Mary. When Marc Anthony Colonna, who had commanded the troops from the Papal States, arrived at Rome on December 13, 1571—Don Juan preferring to remain in the close vicinity of Cyprus—he was received with the greatest joy by Pope and people. In the procession which defiled before the Pope the Swiss were easily recognizable, for to them Colonna had entrusted forty of the leading captives, among whom were the children of the fallen Ali Pasha. And the Pope, in the fullness of joy and gratitude, broke out in the words: "Fuit homo missus a Deo cui nomen erat Joannes."

EUSTACE HAMPOOLE, O. P.

THE METAPHYSICS OF PRAGMATISM.

"SAY that by it I hoped to round out my system, which now is too much like an arch built only on one side," wrote Professor James in a memorandum a short while before his death in August, 1910, directing the publication of this volume,[1] in which he exposes the metaphysics of Pragmatism, and which, unfortunately, he was never able to complete.

For years James had cherished the purpose of stating coherently and systematically his views on the fundamental problems of metaphysics. He realized the fragmentariness of his empirical descriptive studies of mental phenomena, the importance of many problems suggested, but not usually amplified there. He saw the inevitable demand which the science of psychology makes for a further philosophical discussion of these questions. At the same time, his former works, with their statements of facts and laws scientifically established, offered a basis to which this special discussion could constantly refer for its own grounds in experience.

As occasion offered, it is true, Professor James had gone more deeply into some of these questions, e. g., in his volumes on "Pragmatism" and "A Pluralistic Universe." But their interconnection and their bearing upon other problems remained to be established. And this he undertakes to do in the present volume and carries out with a systematic conciseness and clarity begotten of long meditation and deepening insight. As the most mature expression of his thought, it is of special value to the student of philosophy.

It is the study of the universe at large, not so much the description of its details, that we aim at in a consideration of these larger problems. If such a study meets at times with decided hostility in certain quarters, if the earnest seekers after elusive solutions have to suffer not infrequently "from man's native rudeness of mind which maliciously enjoys deriding long words and abstractions," and the philosopher is likened to "a blind man in a dark room, looking for a black hat that is not there," James' genial attitude towards all such "deriders of wise men" is well calculated to take the edge off their pointed shafts.

Philosophy in the full sense is only "man thinking,"[2] thinking about generalities rather than about particulars; and if he find matter for puzzle and astonishment where no one else does, it can scarcely be denied that it is an essential part of a liberal education to know the chief rival attitudes towards life, as the history of

[1] "Some Principles of Philosophy," by William James. Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1911.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

human thinking has developed them and to have heard some of the reasons they can give for themselves. "At a technical school a man may grow into a first-rate instrument for doing a certain job, but he may miss all the graciousness of mind suggested by the term liberal culture. He may remain a cad and not a gentleman, intellectually pinned down to his one narrow subject, literal, unable to suppose anything different from what he has seen, without imagination, atmosphere or mental perspective."[3]

And as to the first whence and the last whither of the cosmic process, men will always eagerly inquire. Besides, how many metaphysical problems confront us, lying, as it were, midway between those two extremes? What is thought, and what are things? How are they connected? What do we mean when we say truth? How can there be a world at all, and might it as well not have been? What is God? How are mind and body joined? Do they act on each other? How does anything act on anything else? How can anything change or grow out of another thing?

Or we may summarize all these questions and many others like them, with Kant, thus: What can I know? What should I do? What may I hope?

It is on the answer to the first of these three questions that depend the answers that have been given in the past and shall be given in the future to the others. The limits and validity of our knowledge have thus become the foundation of all metaphysics.

James' metaphysics accordingly may be summed up in two words: the limits and validity of our knowledge are established by the pragmatic rule; and this in turn leads us in the end to conceive the cosmos as a pluralistic universe.

I.

Rationalism and empiricism, according to James, have filled the history of metaphysics with their warfare. Rationalists are the men of principles; empiricists the men of facts. Rationalist thinking proceeds most willingly by going from wholes to parts, deducing facts from principles, while empiricist thinking proceeds by going from parts to wholes, and explains principles as inductions from facts.[4] Thus Plato, the arch-rationalist, explained the details of nature by their participation in "ideas," which all depended on the supreme idea of the "good."

Rationalist theories are usually optimistic, supplementing the experienced world by clean and pure ideal constructions, and claiming absolute finality for their system. Aristotle and Plato, the

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 7.
[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 35.

scholastics, Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Kant and Hegel, are examples of this.

The temper of finality is foreign to empiricist minds. They aim at accuracy of detail rather than at completeness and are contented to be fragmentary. If they are dogmatic about their method of building "on hard facts," they are willing to be skeptical about the conclusions reached by the method at a given time. Socrates, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, the two Mills, F. A. Lange, J. Dewey, F. C. S. Schiller, Bergson and other contemporaries are specimens of this type.[5]

If this classification seems rather arbitrary to us, suffering as it does from overgeneralization, it is in the latter camp that James himself takes his stand. His psychological theory of cognition hinges on the distinction between percept and concept. "Things" are known to us by our senses and are called "presentations," to distinguish them from the "ideas" or "representations," which we may have without the help of our senses. The former may also be called sensations or percepts, feelings, intuition, the immediate flux of conscious life. The latter may be called concepts or thoughts. Sensation and thought in man are mingled; concepts flow out of percepts and into them again. Percepts are continuous, concepts are discrete; not in their being, for conception as an act is part of the flux of feeling, but discrete from each other in their several meanings. Each concept means just what it singly means, and nothing else. The perceptual flux as such, on the contrary, means nothing, and is but what it immediately is, a much-at-once, with no distinct boundaries, but showing duration, intensity, complexity or simplicity, interestingness, excitingness, pleasantness or their opposites.

Out of the aboriginal sensible muchness attention carves out objects, which conception then names and identifies forever: in the sky "constellations;" on the earth, "beach," "sea," "cliff," "bushes;" out of time we cut "days and nights;" we say *what* each part of the sensible continuum is, and all these abstract *whats* are concepts. The intellectual life of man consist almost wholly in this substitution of the conceptual order for the perceptual order in which his experience originally comes.[6]

The expression of the unvarying relations which the mind discovers between abstract concepts and the combination of them gave rise to various sciences. The value of these rests chiefly on the immutable character of the propositions they are composed of, as it raises them above the mere particular, transient facts.

[5] *Op. cit.* p. 37.
[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 51.

This, according to James, is the rationalistic view; and because under this appellation he has included such widely divergent thinkers as Aristotle and Kant, he accuses rationalists of admitting that it is impossible to explain such concepts as God, perfection, eternity, infinity, immutability, identity, absolute beauty, truth, justice, freedom, necessity, duty, worth, as results of practical experience, as having their origin in sensible perception.

The empiricist view, he claims, holds that they do result from practical experience. And truly, Aristotle and the schoolmen would willingly subscribe to this particular dogma of James' empirical creed. *Nihil in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu* was their oft-repeated slogan. And it is strange that James should have been unaware of this point or should have failed to grasp its full meaning.

But a more important question than that of the psychological origin of our concepts is that of their empirical use and value—the epistemological question of their truth.

In a concept, James holds, we must distinguish its *function* and its *content*. The concept "man" is three things: 1, the word itself; 2, a vague picture of the human form which has its own value in the way of beauty or not; 3, an instrument for symbolizing certain objects from which we may expect human treatment when occasion arises. Similarly, of triangle, cosine—they have their *substantive* value, both as words and as images suggested; but they also have a *functional* value whenever they lead us elsewhere in discourse.[7] Whatever its substantive value may be, the more important part of a concept's significance consists in the consequences to which it leads. And these may either lie in the way of *making us think* or in the way of *making us act*. Hence the use of the *pragmatic rule* in the interpretation of concepts. The Pragmatic Rule is: test every concept by the question: what sensible difference to anybody will its truth make; and you are in the best possible position for understanding what it means, and for discussing its importance. If questioning whether a certain concept be true or false, you can think of absolutely nothing that would practically differ in the two cases, you may assume that the alternative is meaningless, or that your concept is no distinct idea.

This rule applies to concepts of every order of complexity, from simple terms to propositions uniting many terms. "Particular consequences are the only criterions of a concept's meaning, and the only test of its truth;"[8] in other words, the significance of concepts

[7] *Op. cit.*, p. 58.
[8] *Op. cit.*, p. 62.
[9] *Op. cit.*, p. 57.

consists always in their relation to perceptual particulars;[9] their essential office is to coalesce with percepts again, to bring us back to the fullness of original reality; the perceptual flux from which they have been originally distilled, and which is self-sufficing, as all lower creatures in whom conscious life goes on by reflex action sufficiently show.

The ascribing of causes to events and the uniform conditions that regulate those causes, as is done in physical science; the establishment of comparisons and identifications, as is done in mathematics; in short, the substitution of concepts and their connections for the immediate perceptual flow, widens enormously our mental panorama. Had we no concepts, we should live simply "getting" each successive moment of experience, as the sessile sea-anemone on its rock receives whatever nourishment the wash of the waves may bring. But with concepts we go in quest of the absent, meet the remote, actively turn this way or that, bend our experience and make it tell us whither it is bound. We change its order, run it backwards, bring far bits together and separate near bits, jump about over its surface instead of ploughing through its continuity, string its items on as many ideal diagrams as our mind can frame. All these are ways of *handling* the perceptual flux, and *meeting* distant parts of it; and as far as this primary function of conception goes, we can only conclude it to be a faculty superadded to our barely perceptual consciousness for its use in practically adapting us to a larger environment than that of which brutes take account. We *harness* perceptual reality in concepts in order to drive it better to our ends.[10] But these concepts must never be treated as if they gave a deeper quality of truth. The deeper features of reality are found only in perceptual experience: here alone do we acquaint ourselves with continuity or the immersion of one thing in another; here alone with self, with substance, with qualities, with activity in its various modes, with time, with cause, with change, with novelty, with tendency and with freedom.[11]

How this return to the primitive flux of life, to the flow of feeling, "proves the essential identity of philosophy with science,"[12] is indeed hard to understand. For science is nothing if not a carefully built up system of fixed and immutable laws, far removed from the uncritical flow of the perceptions that come and go unceasingly in our daily life, and do not wholly leave us when we are asleep. It is also fallacious to think that this brings us in a closer contact with reality, with things as they are, unless we

[10] P. 65.
[11] P. 97.
[12] P. 101.

admit James' *a priori* idealistic assumption: that things are nothing but our percepts: "Certain grouped sensations are all that corporeal substances are known as; therefore, the only meaning which the word 'matter' can claim is that it denotes such sensations and their groupings."[13] But this seems merely the supreme effort of idealism *aux abois* to bring us in contact with things at any price whatever, even if it be at the sacrifice of reason. As for the Pragmatic Rule, that practical consequences are the only test of a concept's truth, that we must value doctrine according to its result in conduct, James himself shows how arbitrary the application of it is in the examples he adduces.[14] Thus, he says, when we apply the Pragmatic Rule to the concept "God," we find that it means that "you can dismiss certain kinds of fear." But can we? That alternative supposition that God may exist, that consequently we may not dismiss certain kinds of fear, would be a truth "that makes some particular difference in the course of human experience." Again, to take another example of Professor James, the application of the Pragmatic Rule to the concept "cause" means, he says, "that you may expect certain sequences." But what allows you to assert that they are merely "sequences" and not "products?" You are once more merely begging the question at issue by using the Pragmatic Rule. These examples go to show that the Pragmatic Rule is not what it is claimed to be: an ultimate criterion of truth, that "puts us in the best possible condition for understanding what a concept means and for discussing its importance. On the contrary, it presupposes in the one using it assent to a well-defined philosophical system with all its specific tenets and their consequences.

James' theory of "faith and the right to believe" stands in close relation to his pragmatic doctrine.

In most emergencies we have to act on probability and incur the risk of error. "Probability and possibility" are terms applied to things of the conditions of whose coming we are (to some degree at least) ignorant. If we are entirely ignorant of the conditions that make a thing come, we call it a bare possibility. If we know that some of the conditions already exist, it is for us in so far forth a "grounded possibility." It is in that case "probable" just in proportion as the said conditions are numerous and few hindering conditions are in sight.

When the conditions are so numerous and confused that we can hardly follow them, we treat a thing as probable in proportion to the frequency with which things of that kind occur.[15] Now,

[13] Pp. 122-123.
[14] P. 62.
[15] P. 226.

the metaphysical and religious alternatives are largely of this kind. We have but this one life to make up our attitude towards them; no insurance company is there to cover us, and if we are wrong, our error, even though it be not as great as the old hell-fire theology pretended, may yet be momentous. In such questions as that of the *character* of the world, of life being moral in its essential meaning, of our playing a vital part therein, etc., it would seem as if a certain *wholeness* in our faith were necessary. To calculate the probabilities and act fractionally, and treat life one day as a farce and another day as a very serious business, would be to make the worst possible mess of it.[16] But is it not a fact made clear by psychological introspection that faith is more than a question of mere probabilities? And does not experience confirm the fact that of many important truths we admit on faith—and we speak here of mere human faith—we are absolutely certain? If we were not—if we were not certain of the existence of the city of Pekin, which we have never seen; of the existence of King George, whom we have never met—innumerable beliefs would be immediately wiped out of our lives as having no truth-value whatever. But human faith gives us a certainty derived from the testimony of others who know from empirical *evidence*. It ultimately rests on as firm a foundation as any one of that small body of truths which we have demonstrated and made evident to our own satisfaction.

Without thrusting in here any discussion of the supernatural —which would be disclaimed *a priori* as non-existent—we may add that religious faith, in the same way, gives rise to an absolute certainty, which also ultimately rests on the authority of those who have seen and heard.

The Pragmatic Rule, therefore, falls very much short of all the advantages claimed for it as a criterion of truth.

II.

We must, however, further consider the use Professor James makes of it when he endeavors to ascertain the ultimate nature of reality.

Monism contends that there is only one being, an all-inclusive absolute, of which all other reality, whether facts or beings, are manifestations, a universe of "each in all and all in each."

To this conception James opposes his theory of "a pluralistic universe," holding that the entire cosmos, instead of being "a genuine unit," is but "a mass."

That this claim is more germane to experience no one will deny.

[16] Pp. 227-228.

As James well says: "The irreducible outness of *anything,* however infinitesimal, from *anything* else, in *any* respect would be enough, if it were solidly established, to ruin the monistic doctrine. And to say that there is no disconnection, that the separations we uncritically accept are illusory—that reality does not exist in the shape of *eaches, everys, anys, eithers,* but only in the shape of an *all* or a *whole,* is on the face of it simply silly, for we find practical disconnections without number. My pocket is disconnected with Mr. Morgan's bank account and King Edward's mind is disconnected with this book."[17]

And James very pointedly punctures those vague hankerings after a "unity that is indescribable," after that wonderful, mystical "One" as exemplified not only in Plotinus and in Hindooism, but also in many modern pantheists.[18]

Scholasticism, as he properly remarks, always stood for the doctrine that the universe forms a pluralism from the substance-point-of-view.[19] But, he says, its doctrine was too uncritical; for what does the use of the Pragmatic Rule tell us about the concept "substance?" What difference in practical experience is it supposed to make that we have each a personal substantial principle? This difference, that we can remember and appropriate our past, calling it "mine." What difference that in this book there is a substantial principle? This, that certain optical and tactical sensations cling permanently together in a cluster. The fact that certain perceptual experiences do seem to *belong together* is thus all that the word "substance" means.[20]

In the same manner the "oneness" affirmed of the world is merely a name like "substance," descriptive of the fact that certain *specific and verifiable connections* are found among the parts of the experiential flux. All the "oneness" in the universe is a cognitional "oneness," or, as James puts it, through conceptual abstraction we get "what the oneness of the world is known as."[21]

Things do not *belong* together, but are merely connected by the bare conjunctions "with" or "and."

Does this not jeopardize the world's rationality and invalidate all formulation of scientific laws? No, "for it is sufficient that when oneness is predicated it shall mean definitely ascertainable conjunctive forms."[22] This leaves room for "possibility," "novelty," "freedom," notions so native to our common sense. "Free will

[17] Pp. 114-115.
[18] Pp. 116 ff., 138 ff.
[19] P. 119.
[20] P. 123.
[21] P. 132.
[22] P. 143.

means nothing but real novelty; so pluralism accepts the notion of free will."[23] As a consequence pluralism is neither optimistic nor pessimistic, but melioristic. While monism is a more emotional and religious view of the world, admitting that the world is saved already by its union with the divine absolute, pluralism is a more moral view, in this sense that it puts morality more in the foreground, and "thinks that the world may be saved on condition that its parts shall do their best."[24]

And it solves the problem of evil which remains a puzzle for monism; for if the absolute be the all-good, if Perfection be the source of all things, how should there be imperfection? For pluralism the problem of imperfection presents only the practical problem of how to get rid of it.[25]

Still, the question recurs. if free will exists, if "novelty" may be freely introduced in the world, are we not driven to the conclusion that, "what comes, may have to be treated as a matter of chance," thus again defeating all our aims at scientific accuracy. We are led then to ask: in what manner does new being come? Is it through and through the consequence of older being, or is it a matter of chance so far as other being goes?

"So far as physical nature goes, few of us experience any real temptation to postulate any real novelty. The notion of eternal elements and their mixture serves us in so many ways that we unhesitatingly adopt the theory that primordial being is unalterable in its attributes as well as in its quantity, and that the laws by which we describe its habits are uniform in the strictest mathematical sense."[26]

"It is when we come to human lives that our point of view changes. It is hard to imagine that 'really' our own subjective experiences are only molecular arrangements, even though the molecules be conceived as beings of a psychic kind. A material fact may indeed be different from what we feel it to be; but what sense is there in saying that a feeling which has no other reality than to be felt is not as it *is* felt?"[27]

Thus again, while chance happenings are banished from the physical universe, liberty is assured to man.

One more difficulty remains to be removed. "The classic obstacle to pluralism has always been what is known as the principle of causality. This principle has been taken to mean that the effect in some way already exists in the cause. If this be so, the effect

[23] P. 140.
[24] P. 142.
[25] P. 138.
[26] P. 150.
[27] P. 151.

cannot be absolutely novel, and in no radical sense can pluralism be true."[28] Aristotle, who made the first definite inquiry into causes, held that the "why" of anything is furnished by four principles: the material, formal, efficient and final cause. But what one generally means by the cause of anything is its "efficient" cause. "It is scholastically defined as 'that which produces something else by a real activity proceeding from itself.' This is unquestionably the view of common sense, and scholasticism is only common sense grown quite articulate."[29]

The scholastic doctrine certainly obviated the difficulties of monism, for which causation is merely a deducing of the identical from the identical. Scholasticism allows of effects that are really "products," that are really new, and yet not "chance products," for *quidquid est in effectu debet esse prius aliquo modo in causa.* Scholasticism always respected common sense and escaped the frank denial of all genuine novelty by the vague qualification *aliquo modo.* This allowed the effect to differ *aliquo modo* from its cause.[30] Yet, after acknowledging this much, James, under the pressure of an idealism from which he sees no escape, goes on to stultify this concept of causality because it is incomplete, because it does not include the essential note of activity.

This concept being an abstraction, it evidently does not include the note of activity as something immediately real, immediately experienced. In order then to get causality in all its completeness, James reduces it to a mere subjective feeling as experienced in the flux of life: "There is doubtless somewhere an original perceptual experience of the kind of thing we mean by causation. Where is this typical experience originally got? Evidently it is in our own personal activity-situations. In all of these what we feel is that a previous field of 'consciousness,' containing (in the midst of its complexity) the idea of a result, develops gradually into another field in which that result either appears as accomplished or else is prevented by obstacles against which we still feel ourselves to press. As I now write I am in one of these activity-situations. I 'strive' after words which I only half prefigure, but which, when they shall have come, must satisfactorily complete the nascent sense I have of what they ought to be. Some of the words come wrong, and then I feel a resistance, not muscular, but mental, which instigates a new instalment of my activity, accompanied by more or less feeling of exertion."[31] In such a continuously developing experiential series our concrete perception

[28] P. 190.
[29] P. 191.
[30] P. 193.
[31] Pp. 210-211.

of causality is found in operation. If the word have any meaning at all, it must mean what we there live through. "The percipi in these original experiences is the esse. If there is anything hiding in the background, it ought not to be called causal agency, but should get itself another name."[32]

The fact remains, however, that these "perceptual experiences of causality" would mean nothing to us, would make no difference in our lives, to apply the Pragmatic Rule, if they were not conceptually apprehended, seized upon abstractedly from the here and now. The search for real causes in science and philosophy would dwindle to an enumeration of phenomenal antecedents; there would not even be a "search," for the word would have no meaning for a being not endowed with the power of abstraction.[33] Moreover, this conception of causality is narrow and fragmentary in that it arbitrarily refuses to go beyond self, to be verified in the external world.

For granted that this is a pluralistic universe, whence is it? The question harasses the mind even more than it does in a monistic system whose absolute is eternal and is continuously evolving phenomenal realities.

In a "piecemeal universe," where causation plays a real part, where the mind is constantly pursuing effects until it discovers the ultimate why of the last product, the thinker cannot escape the problem of an ultimate Being. Here James' philosophy falls lamentably short; all his subtle powers of reasoning seem to abandon him, and he agrees that there is no answer whatever to the question. "No one has intelligibly banished the mystery of *fact*. Whether the original nothing burst into God and vanished, as night vanishes in day, while God thereupon became the creative principle of all lesser beings; or whether all things have foisted and shaped themselves imperceptibly into existence, the same amount of existence has in the end to be begged by the philosopher. . . . For all of us *fact* forms a datum, a gift, or Vorgefundenes, which we cannot burrow under, explain or get behind. It makes itself somehow, and our business is far more with its what than with its whence or why."[34]

That this is one of the weakest spots in James' metaphysics no one will deny, and James himself is well aware of it. There being no infinite primal cause—which would be absurd, he says, since infinity connects with number—James is finally driven to

[32] P. 213.

[33] It may be seen from the foregoing that James' ideas are closely connected with those of Bergson; and indeed he himself claims intellectual kinship with this writer.

[34] Pp. 44-45.

admit that "reality must in the end be begged piecemeal, not everlastingly deduced from other reality."[35] All concepts of the infinite he considers as inwardly absurd and contradictory, and "it is better to accept the opaquely given data of perception according to which additions to reality come in finite and perceptible changes like the successive drops by which a cask of water is filled when whole drops fall into it or nothing."[36]

As an argument against the monistic hypothesis James' criticism of the infinite is final: "a total is made up of parts, and parts are numerable, if not actually, at least potentially; if not by the imagination, then at least by the mind. But it is of no value when directed against an infinite *a se,* a being that is outside of space and time, and consequently does not fall within the categories of a standing or a growing infinite. That a finite mind cannot know such an infinite is indeed "but a pseudo-problem." As the infinite is of a kind that transcends all being we have any immediate knowledge of, it can be conceived only by a process of analogy and negation, based, however, on perceptual experience.

In the last analysis, then, the pluralistic universe is one to which there is no whence, no whither.

Even the most biased thinker will hardly be satisfied with this arbitrary assumption and this truncated metaphysics. For it means the complete abdication of reason, which must no longer seek for an explanation; which must no longer seek to know things in general by their *ultimate* causes in so far as natural reason can attain to such knowledge; but must confine itself to a mere *description* of the universe in its details—the very task that James himself deprecates as outside the scope of metaphysics.

Moreover, if conduct is the most important thing in life, as Pragmatism holds, the whence and the whither of the cosmos and of man make so great a difference in our existence that Pragmatism falls double short in failing to take account of them.

J. B. Ceulemans.

Moline, Illinois.

[35] P. 165.
[36] P. 172.

IRISH DRAMA AND IRISH VIEWS.

TENNYSON hailed Milton as a "God-gifted organ voice of England." How far Milton was a very great poet is one question; how far he is rightly to be called a "voice of England" may be another. In the same way certain recent "Irish" plays may be discussed with reference to their abstract value as works of art or with reference to the genuineness and completeness of their inspiration as pictures of Irish life. The two fields of consideration are, indeed, not capable of distinct and absolute delimitation; yet different they are and their separate investigators may possibly arrive at conclusions not easy to reconcile.

The numerous dramas of various kinds, but all with Irish scenes as their background and Irish individuals for their characters, which have lately become in America and elsewhere prominent objects for discussion, appear to my mind far too vast a theme for any single paper, even if the problems involved were not (as they often are) such as it is peculiarly difficult for contemporaries to solve. I ask permission, therefore, to contribute to the views already abundantly expressed as to these dramas, the views of one Irishman who has found the solace of many a leisure hour in the original drama of Greece, Spain, Italy, France, Germany and England, one who has studied since its commencement this dramatic movement and who knows well the Ireland it purports to depict—his views upon the value, as pictures of Ireland, of the characteristic drama given us by that movement—upon this only, with but casual references to the other question of their purely literary merit.

I will, therefore, not proceed to dispute the general value of the high commendations passed on each other's work by various representatives of this new Irish movement—for example, by Mr. Yeats on Mr. Synge's—nor of those which (as I fully admit) outsiders of high competence have bestowed on the productions of both and others. I wish to inquire how far Ireland has refused, and how far she may have justly refused, to recognize in the new drama a fair portrait of herself—a presentation to the world of what she genuinely was in any stage of her immemorial life.

I do not think I am fairly chargeable with any passionate one-sidedness or injustice in doing this. No doubt the time for perfectly cool academic appraisement has scarcely yet come. It is difficult to expect any one (especially any Irishman) to "talk the language of posterity" about "The Playboy of the Western World" and like productions, while fervid Irishmen in New York are receiving them with turnips and bad eggs, and while the London press is

assuring us that never was Ireland so truly and happily represented as by the parricides and viragoes of Synge's plays. But I have always been inclined to deprecate extreme demands for theatrical idealization, always inclined to support the artist's plea for elbow-room, always slow to join the decriers while there was anything praiseworthy to be found. It is with regret and without passion that I speak of the Abbey Theatre plays as a systematic propaganda of calumny. I am speaking of facts, not of intentions. I do not wish to involve in one indiscriminate charge all who have in any way taken part in the theatrical movement during the past twelve years. But the dramatic movement, as a whole, is calumnious, and as a whole is certainly not inconscient.

I will touch on the second point first. The *coryphaei* of the movement know perfectly well what they are doing. Neither in Mr. Yeats, nor in Mr. Moore (his quondam coadjutor), nor in others who might be mentioned, have we the "sweet, gushing child of nature," who "sings but as the linnets sing." As long ago as 1901 Mr. Stephen Gwynn remarked that Mr. Yeats, "the head and forefront of the whole movement," "understands to perfection the arts of the propagandist." He said many amusing things about Mr. George Moore as a person who "has the talent of awakening controversy," who at no period could be restrained from playing to the London gallery, and whose occupation at that juncture might be described as that of standing on his head (metaphorically) to attract public attention. He tells us how Mr. Yeats called Mr. Martyn's "Heather Field" "a masterpiece unique in modern prose-drama," and how Mr. Moore declared that "no one except Shakespeare and Mr. Yeats had successfully written a blank-verse drama." Even the most academic observer of contemporary literature could not fail to observe how effectively this combined boldness and adroitness in mutual self-advertisement has been kept up by the leaders of the Abbey Theatre enterprises. As for the American press and people, whom I may describe, without unbecoming flattery, as singularly alive to the points of effective business propaganda, they recognized and appreciated from the start this aspect of the new enterprise. They realized that they had among them in Mr. Yeats a gentleman whose standing as a great dramatist might be doubted, but who certainly was a first-class showman. I have by me a large number of cuttings from American papers and also notes of the communications made by Mr. Yeats concerning the success of his tours in America to the Irish press at home. It might be amusing, if space permitted to quote from these records, and note how skillfully "successes" were worked up out of sometimes rather unmanageable facts. It would be unfair, of course,

in ordinary circumstances, to make much out of this, and absurd to treat as necessarily criminal the arts by which in this competitive world High Art itself (in the largest of capitals) must often depend for its pot-boiling capabilities. It is worth dwelling on only that a warning may be recorded against the too literal acceptance from the mouths of the Abbey Theatre propagandists of assurances with regard to their triumphs elsewhere. America ought not too hastily accept Mr. Yeats as the sole trumpet of Irish opinion on dramatic matters. America ought not too simply believe on Mr. Yeats' assurance that Ireland has taken to her bosom, as a genuine offspring, the "Irish" dramas represented by Synge's, and that only an "old man" here and there ventures to question the new family arrangements.

From the beginning the Irish dramatic enterprise, of which the Abbey Theatre and its company is the chief, though not the sole representative, has deserved the credit of being managed with much skill and ability. We may recall its history, in order to discuss a few points in its theory. Some thirteen years ago Mr. Yeats, Mr. George Moore and Mr. Martyn appeared in Dublin in the character of apostles and founders of a new theatrical life. The new stage was to be fresh, racy of the soil, full of Irish life. Mr. Yeats told the public that his "Countess Cathleen" was "an attempt to mingle personal thought and feeling with the beliefs and customs of Christian Ireland. Ireland has already many moving songs and ballads which are quite her own. The 'Countess Cathleen' is an attempt to unite a more ample method to feeling not less national, Celtic and distinctive." The same proclamation was made concerning other works, and support in its name was entreated from all classes, in particular a subsidy from the Corporation of Dublin. How little that was "national, Celtic and distinctive" these works contained, how little respect they showed for "the belief and customs of Christian Ireland," soon became manifest to all. A loud outcry was raised. Mr. Yeats was ready with explanations. The old professions were practically thrown overboard and all difficulties were explained away by means of "symbolism." If Irish peasants were represented as miserable poltroons, ready to sell their souls for bread, this was merely an allegory—it was simply mistaking the end of a work of art to suppose that this was a picture of anything "national, Celtic and distinctive." If Irish peasants were represented as kicking to pieces a shrine of the Blessed Virgin, this should not excite any indignation; it is foolish to imagine that this is meant as a representation of "the beliefs and customs of Christian Ireland." During twenty years this same ingenious dodging between realist pretension and

symbolic excuses has been recurrent. In 1905 Mr. Yeats wrote in "Samhain"—a little paper exclusively devoted to Abbey Theatre propaganda—that the art of Synge and similar pessimist drama gives the truth as to the Irish peasantry, while the "sentimental" and "bourgeois" mind of writers like Gerald Griffin and Kickham simply disguised it under "conventional idealism." On another occasion misrepresentation is acknowledged and is glorified. "The misrepresentation of the average life of a nation that follows of necessity from an imaginative delight in energetic characters and extreme types enlarges the energy of a people by the spectacle of energy." But why, one is at once tempted to inquire, are the extreme types all at one particular extreme? And how, we ask again, are we to expect "the energy of a people" to be "enlarged" by the contemplation of such deplorable types as occupy the larger share of the "Abbey" stage? A little later on we find Mr. Yeats taking up the bold attitude that misrepresentation of our people is nothing blameworthy. "After all," he writes—still in the same number of "Samhain"—"if our plays are slanders upon their country; if to represent upon the stage a hard old man like Cosgar or a rapacious old man like Shan, or a faithless wife like Nora Burke, or to select from history faithless Gormleith, for a theme is to represent the nation at something less than its full moral worth; if every play played in the Abbey Theatre now and in time to come be something of a slander, is anybody one penny the worse?" Mr. Yeats, in other words, wants, without quitting his professions of truth and reality, without quitting his hopes of generous subsidies from Irish purse-holders, to be at liberty to patent new types of stage Irishmen for the amusement of the foreigner. No less extraordinary a plea has been offered for the hideousness of "The Playboy of the Western World" by Mr. Yeats' distinguished associate, Lady Gregory, who tells us that this play may be regarded, if not as a picture of the present, then as a prophecy of the future. "Emigration," writes Lady Gregory, "is carrying off year by year the strongest, the most healthy, the most energetic, and some day it may not be a prophecy, but a commonplace that man coming with a name for strength and daring even in crime may take the mastery of a feeble countryside." Surely, with all deference to Lady Gregory's judgment, we could afford to wait for these horrors till they come! Is there really so little in the past or present of Ireland worthy of our dramatists' attention, that they must needs focus their eyes upon the hypothetically sordid, base, ugly and deformed? Are we so completely lacking in illustrations of goodness and nobility that past, present and future must be ransacked to exhibit us as moral lepers?

Again and again Mr. Yeats and his friends have exhorted us to patience in the name of all the arts and all the muses. We are "misunderstanding the nature of literature," we are "denying the right of the individual mind to see the world in its own way," we are "insisting on a bourgeois timidity and insincerity." In all honesty I do not think Ireland can be fairly asked to take the matter in that high academic way. We are susceptible to calumny; and I think we are rightly so. Ireland is not a big, strong country that can, as it were, bully others into admiration of her good qualities. She cannot, like France, Germany and England, sit serene in her strength and her achievements and care little whether others admire her or not. Nor, finally, can she, like the big countries, trust that the world knows her history, that the world has fairly measured what she is and what she can do. No! The age-long work of the destroyer made an easy road for the inroads of the calumniator. The calumniator has not closed his course to this day. The caricaturist supplies the portraits of us that circulate in millions and form the current opinion of the world. We are not all so pleasantly self-deceived as not to know and recognize this. No doubt the Irishman, especially the roving Irishman, has often been too ready to play the buffoon for a laugh or a livelihood. No doubt, too, he has been often too prompt to emphasize domestic differences in presence of a cynical world. Dr. Johnson, we know, told a Scotch friend that the Scotch were in a conspiracy to cheat the world; "but the Irish, sir, are a fair-minded people; they never speak well of each other." But this spirit of reckless Irish generosity with regard to each other's characters has, I think, happily diminished. Those who indulge in it are the few. Those whom it renders deeply indignant are the millions.

What good reason there is to be indignant at the present moment is sufficiently manifested by the history of such plays as the "Playboy," the "Well of the Saints" and the "Shadow of the Glen"—the history of their rapturous reception by English audiences and English critics. These judges did not, it would seem, always know very well when to laugh and when to look serious; but, at all events, the scenes and personages put before them struck a chord which was ready to vibrate. Comic or tragic, it was what they wanted. Here were new stage Irishmen as funny and grotesque as the old ones, but up-to-date and quite horribly realistic! Their utmost extravagances of action and speech were hailed as a revelation of the real Ireland which sentimentalists try to hide. They have the satisfaction of finding that what they call with reasonable pride "the Anglo-Saxon race in the United States" has largely followed suit; and the Continent, as always, has seen and settled this Irish

question with the help of glasses made in England. Is it fair in the face of such a state of English and world-wide opinion to ask Irishmen, in the name of academic principles, to put their *imprimatur* on work which is responsible for doing them what they feel to be a grievous wrong?

What is perhaps most depressing and surprising in the general aspect of the recent Irish dramatic output is the degree to which an ugly and melancholy realism, a despondent pessimism, are found to have cast their shadows over the work of younger (nay, even of very young men). I hope and believe that this is a fashion merely, a pose learned from a leader, one which, like other fashions, will pass away. What was natural to Synge—and not particularly Irish in him—has been adopted for their own by a number of young disciples. The fashion is even less Irish than the original inspiration. It is as uncharacteristic of Ireland as the Byronism of English youths eighty years ago was uncharacteristic of England, and we believe it will pass much more quickly than the earlier malady. The best brains among the rising generation are, in fact, already coming to see that unmixed gloom, discord and bitterness make bad art as well as bad ethics; that in any case they make but an ugly caricature of Ireland and her people—of a land whose sorrows are singularly set off by mercurial disposition and by supernatural faith.

But another reason for the singular predominance of these undesirable elements must not be left unmentioned. It is an easily understood one—the selective mind and will of the Abbey Theatre management. How far they have exercised their power of choice and veto I cannot say. But it is no secret in Dublin that that power has powerfully contributed towards the setting up of a strongly-characterized school of drama, that decidedly able works by young authors who were afterwards lucky enough to get their chance elsewhere, and then scored triumphantly, were rejected by the Abbey censors, because they did not sing in tune with the Abbey chorus.

We have been told that Synge's portraits of the Irish peasantry must be truthful because of his close study of the originals. Admitting the fact, the argument is quite fallacious. Minute study of the sayings and doings of others may surely be carried on in very various subjective states, and through very variously-colored mental glasses. The artists of *Punch* or *Judge* very frequently (we have no doubt) make a close study of the personages they depict to the world. But does any one propose to take them as authentic family portraits? Art, good or bad, is always selective. The personal equation cannot be eliminated and is sometimes a

huge factor. It was emphatically so with Synge. Synge used themes named from Ireland to express—himself! That he always expressed himself rather than his subjects is the opinion I have heard expressed by one who has studied him very closely and appears to rank among his strong admirers—M. Maurice Bourgeois.

Was the soul thus expressed in any way characteristic of Ireland?

Sprung of a family of singularly successful office-seekers who came to Ireland from England into the wake of George the First's soldiers, and attained a great number of high posts in a Church abhorred by five-sixths of the Irish people, J. M. Synge approached the age of forty before he had taken the slightest interest in anything Irish. He devoted himself to modern music; he experimented aimlessly in literature; he went to Paris in search of sensations and a livelihood; he devoured great quantities of French literature. It is Mr. Yeats' claim that he first directed Synge's attention to the Aran Isles and to the possibilities for an artist to be gleaned there. Thither, at all events, Synge went, and there he found appropriate and original background, coloring and dialect for the ideas to which his own marked idiosyncrasy and his studies of Parisian life and literature had given soil and nutriment. The result as seen in "Riders to the Sea" is something fresh and surprising—a blend in which the gloom of Synge's own nature is blent with the wildness of Atlantic storms and mists, the pessimism of a Baudelaire with the lingering superstitions of Catholic fisher folk. It is a remarkable amalgam, but one which to those who know Irish life lacks something of the convincing unity and inevitableness of a work of genius. Nor is "Riders to the Sea," short as it is, a masterpiece of construction; it contains at least one glaring improbability.

The foreign influences and elements in Synge's work have been emphatically denied by Mr. Yeats and other of his admirers. Not all the proofs given of it may be equally strong or pertinent. But some witnesses cannot be gainsaid. There is Mr. D. J. O'Donoghue, for example, now librarian of University College, Dublin, who was particularly well acquainted and associated with Synge during his Parisian life. He has more than once put in writing his reminiscences of the man and his impressions as to his art. It was Mr. O'Donoghue who recommended Synge to read Pierre Loti's "Pecheurs d'Islande," the book which proved in Synge's mind the germinal seed of "Riders to the Sea." It is he who has told us of Synge's particular interest in Baudelaire. Eccentric, though without affectation, himself, Synge was much taken with the Parisian poet's labored endeavors to "épater le bourgeois." It

was Synge from whom Mr. O'Donoghue first heard a story concerning Baudelaire, which has been quoted more than once, but may perhaps be here repeated: The French poet was fond of surprising his friends as well as the staid middle class; and one day he called on Maxime du Camp with green hair. Du Camp pretended not to notice anything, much to the annoyance of the poet, who finally asked his friend whether he saw anything peculiar about him. "Not more than usual," said Du Camp. "But I have dyed my hair green!" exclaimed Baudelaire. "Oh! everybody's hair is more or less green," replied the critic; "if it were sky-blue, now, that would be a bit strange." The poet dashed out of the room and, meeting another friend who was about to call on Du Camp, said: "Don't go near him to-day; he's in a rotten humor."

Another of Baudelaire's freakish ways was to announce in a matter-of-fact way to any company he happened to be in that he had done something very terrible. Thus he once opened a conversation in a restaurant with the words, "Après avoir assassiné mon pauvre père," to the astonishment of the numerous listeners. It is no very bold flight of fancy to see in this freak of his friend the suggestion of Synge's actual parricide in the "Playboy." But what is to be said of the bold policy of turning the Parisian cynical jest into a reality of Mayo peasant life? What (at all events) of its value as a picture of Mayo peasant life? "To me," writes Mr. O'Donoghue, "the motive of the 'Playboy' always seemed useless and absurd, except as a réclame. I do not see any dramatic possibility in it. There is far more in the idea of a fugitive having killed a landlord or agent; for peasants would not unnaturally assume that the murderer had some reason for his crime. But then it is conventional, it is not outré, it might not stir the jaded interest of an 'intellectual' audience! Many people, in Ireland and elsewhere, have killed their fathers. But if you can represent the whole countryside as glorying in the deed, you do produce a sort of sensation and create a sufficiently villainous environment in which all kinds of absurdities are possible, and in which you can give free play to your fancy. You may then outrage all the conventions consistently enough."

Mr. Yeats is very angry with those who have pointed out that "In the Shadow of the Glen" has had other sources than study of Irish life in Wicklow. So little, in fact, is the story characteristic of that or any Irish region that it is highly reasonable to point out not only the old fable of the Ephesian Matron, but also Voltaire's Zadig (chapter 2) as probable inspirers. The root idea of the "Well of the Saints"—disillusionment as a result of recovery from blindness—is anticipated in a play by M. Clemenceau—

a play with Chinese characters—much more clearly than by anything Synge ever heard of in Arran or in Wicklow.

So long ago as 1901 Mr. Stephen Gwynn gave pretty plainly his views as to the exotic character of the new theatrical movement. Of Mr. Martyn's play he wrote that "every line" bore out the suggestion that the author "was working under the influence of Ibsen and his imitators." Of "Diarmuid and Grania"—a tragedy in which Mr. Moore and Mr. Yeats collaborated—he records the current criticism that the authors "had gone to Irish legend to find in epic tradition the plot of an average French novel." He shows at considerable length that the Irish legend had been mutilated, disfigured, degraded by its modern rehandlers; that for its original beauties and faults, strength and crudity has been substituted the "fadeur" of Parisian corruption masked by heroic names. As for Mr. Yeats' "Countess Cathleen," some one else pointed out that this play was founded on a foreign story picked up somewhere abroad by Mr. John Augustus O'Shea. Synge's favorite author, as we have said, was Baudelaire. Than the "Fleurs du Mal" it would be difficult to conceive a worse breviary for one about to devote himself to the interpretation of Irish peasant life. It was the monstrous reading of a Synge-Baudelaire view of life into the Catholic peasantry of Mayo and Arran that led to such strange monsters as the characters of "The Playboy" and other like plays of the Abbey Theatre repertoire—characters so remote from reality as sometimes to have set actors and readers quite at a loss as to whether they should be interpreted as tragic or as farcical.

How Catholic the Irish peasant is has been a familiar topic—it has recently been emphasized by two writers who rather wish it were otherwise—G. B. Shaw and S. Brooks (in the *Fortnightly*). The Abbey Theatre repertoire of peasant plays is either un-Catholic or anti-Catholic. The latter tendency, however, has been chiefly shown in works that have prudently (so far) been kept off the stage. One of them is Mr. Yeats' "Where There Is Nothing." I myself knew the person whose character and career suggested the piece to Mr. Yeats. He was not of sound mind; but amid varying eccentricities of conduct he remained through life a most devout Catholic. Will it be believed that Mr. Yeats makes him the mouthpieec of an anti-religious anarchism and his adventures an excuse for some rather gross caricatures of things venerated by Catholics?

It is absurd to say that critics like Dr. Sigerson, Mr. O'Donoghue and others (including some not Irish and many not Catholic) when they decline to accept plays such as "The Playboy" are

actuated by a narrow desire to hamper unduly the self-expression in dramatic form of Irish minds. Rather is the very reverse the case. They wish to withdraw Irish drama from a rut of insistence on the ugly and mean. They don't want young dramatists kept in the background or discouraged because they break away from the convention of ugliness and meanness. They do not desire servitude to any convention. Let us by all means have a gallery of types as full and adequate as even a Shakespeare could make them out of the dramatic material provided! The pity is that there is no such gallery of Irish portraits. The grievance is that, as in the days of Vousden's old ballad—we are "unfairly represented;" that types and traits not characteristic of our nation, and at the same time eminently injurious to its good name, are persistently put forward, while numerous types and traits which are genuinely characteristic and highly honorable are wholly or unduly kept in the background. I have heard this argument urged with convincing eloquence by the distinguished president of the National Literary Society. He showed us the Irish peasant as history again and again has shown him—an imperfect human being certainly, but singularly unlike the sordid, mean, mercenary creature, closed to the ideal, dull to the spiritual, grasping of the actual, whom—almost alone—drama after drama of the Irish Literary Theatre has put before us. He told us true tales of self-devotion and self-sacrifice, of the heavenward aspirations, of the deep unworldliness of humble heroes and heroines; tales of conscience obeyed in the teeth of war and famine, of heroism in battle, of heroism under the lash, the pitch-cap and the gallows—tales of courage rising sublime over the racks of persecution and the wiles of proselytism; tales such as no country should forget or suffer to be forgotten. He recalled these incidents of the past with an evident emotion that gained his audience. He complained that of all this, of all that ennobled our island's past, glorified its recent sorrows and gave hope for its future, nothing was to be gathered from the production of these Irish dramatists. These real scenes, these real characters have no place, or almost none, on the boards of the Abbey Theatre. They are unknown to the realism, or symbolism, or whatever it is, of Yeats, Synge, Lady Gregory and their younger imitators—we may omit the name of Mr. George Moore, who has at least retired from the galaxy and dropped his comedy rôle of being a representative of Irish ideas. It is not enough to be assured that this or that dramatist spent months assimilating the ways, beliefs and dialects of the Arran Islanders or that he utilized during a stay in Wicklow his opportunities of overhearing servants' conversation from a room below. Promised portraits and put off with what we

know to be drab or glaring caricatures, we are entitled to deny flatly the author's rank as a Hals or a Reynolds and to inquire why and how he has failed to be either a great reproductive artist or a skillful photographer. Dr. Sigerson, like Mr. Stephen Gwynn, showed how strongly foreign was the inspiration of this so-called national drama, and he spoke with the authority of a specialist of more than one kind of "phobia," more than one kind of "pathia." He spoke of an exotic and morbid preoccupation with sex problems, of the regrettable over-occupation of French literature with such problem-themes—themes which might be a natural if not admirable outgrowth of Parisian and Berlin corruptions, but which are inexcusably out of place in the fore-front of Irish national drama. It can hardly be denied that the president of the National Literary Society—a pathologist, a poet and a prose writer—knew what he was talking about. No one who knows anything about him can say that he affords a type of the "sentimental" or the "bourgeois" mind, that he is a narrowly clerical or narrowly provincial person. He must plead guilty, it is true, to being a fervently patriotic Irishman. But must that be taken as a serious disqualification in one speaking of Irish pictures of Irish life? Must we, under pain of folly, prefer the views of persons whose ways and thoughts have been moulded in Paris or London, or who have managed to grow up as aliens and strangers in Ireland itself? America has known among her literary children some, not of least note, whose sympathies and breeding were thoroughly alien to her. Does she (great and independent as she is) endure gladly their being taken as her types and type-portrayers?

George O'Neill, S. J.

Dublin, Ireland.

THE IRISH PARLIAMENT RESTORED IN ALTERED SHAPE.

ON THE 29th of July, 1800 A. D., the instrument called the Act of Union between Great Britain and Ireland, having received the royal signature, became law. But the validity of that instrument never was recognized, from that day until this, by the masses of the Irish people, because they knew that it was procured by the foulest of means. A reign of terror preceded its introduction, martial law was in full blast in many parts of the country and corpses of Irish patriots were swinging from the

bridges of the chief cities in Leinster, Munster and Ulster. One and a half million pounds were spent by the British Parliament, at the instance of William Pitt, Prime Minister, through Lord Castlereagh, in corrupting the Irish members—all Protestants—who were asked to vacate their seats in order to allow the measure to go through, while more than twenty-two millions more were added to the public debt of Ireland and kept in a separate account, to be wiped off gradually, by means of increased taxation, by Irish payments, until two conditions should have been brought about—first, that the two debts should come to bear to each other the proportion of fifteen parts for Great Britain to two parts for Ireland; second, that the respective circumstances of the two countries should admit of uniform taxation. After that they were to be consolidated. They were consolidated in 1817. The Irish debt had increased at that time from 28,545,134 pounds to the enormous total of 112,704,773 millions. Ireland was made to pay for the long wars between England and France, and some smaller countries, from 1800 to 1817—in the bringing about of which she was neither instrumental nor concerned in any way. She was compelled to pay the cost of the Rebellion of 1798, which William Pitt had deliberately gotten up for the ignoble purpose of destroying that independence which Grattan and Lord Charlemont had wrung from the fears of King George and the impotency of his Ministry. She was compelled to pay even for the razor with which Castlereagh, as O'Connell, with savage irony, declared, had cut his own throat. Since the year of the Crimean War (1854-5) the burdens of Ireland, over and above what she should have been called upon to bear, even under the Act of Union, amounted to over three millions a year for a period of many years, as was found by a Parliamentary commission charged with the duty of determining the state of the financial relations between the two countries, about twenty years ago. Its chairman, Mr. Lough, an English Conservative member, so reported to the Conservative Government (Lord Salisbury's) of the time. But despite this astounding revelation of gross injustice no action was ever taken by any Ministry, until the present one acceded to power, either to right the wrong or stop its continuance. Had Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bills passed the House of Lords, arrangements would have been made for the cessation of the disgraceful plunder. In the measure now being debated in Parliament there are provisions for a settlement based on equity as between the two countries. But the debt which Great Britain owes to Ireland, in all honor and conscience, cannot be measured by any arithmetical vehicle. She has given of her genius, her blood, her bone and sinew, in the building up of the vast Eastern Empire, to

a degree that is simply immeasurable. Her Wellingtons, her Napiers, her Goughs, her Wolseleys, her Robertses, her Kitcheners, were the props and pillars on which rested the stupendous fabric for more than a century.

Since Ireland fell under the blight of the British connection she never received the benefit of true representative government. Parliaments were held in the early years of the Pale, but the principal legislation enacted in these aimed at the securing of the position of the invaders against the onslaughts of the native Irish and the extirpation of the real owners of the soil, their laws, their language, their nationality, and, later on, their religion. This was the general situation. During the Tudor period a great deal of the legislation enacted in the Dublin Parliament was directed to the object of crippling the industrial growth of Ireland and her commerce on the Continent of Europe, and throwing that commerce into the hands of British traders. To this end a series of laws were passed by the British Parliament and imposed on Ireland. They were known as Poyning's laws, their inventor being an English official who had been sent over to examine into the state of the chief ports in Ireland in regard to exports and imports, and make a report on the subject to the Privy Council and the English Parliament. A most infamous law was passed, on the reception of his report, decreeing that no Irish ship could take a cargo to any foreign port until she had taken out her bills of lading at an English seaport—that is to say, paid heavy toll to England ere she could proceed to do business with any part of the European Continent.

It was the commercial tyranny of England—of which the foregoing instance was but one out of many that could be cited—that at last brought on the agitation that reached its climax in the resolutions passed by Grattan and backed by the Irish Volunteers. The first clash occurred when the English Ministry attempted to force on Ireland a perpetual Mutiny Act—in the same way as Mr. Balfour forced on Ireland a perpetual Coercion Act. (The Act is now dead and its sponsor politically dead.) The Mutiny Act to which the shackled Irish Parliament had assented was to run only for six months, but the British one sent it back with the limitation eliminated and the word "perpetual" substituted. The Irish Legislature resented the alteration and resisted it as well as the pretensions of England to control the commercial policy of Ireland. This was the psychological moment when the spirit of Irish liberty was to be born, for out of that act of English insolence sprang the resolve of Grattan and the Irish Parliament to assert the independence of Ireland in regard to her own legislative affairs, leaving only the link of the Crown between the two countries.

Great as was the change in the moral standing of Ireland, as a separate entity, effected by the winning of Parliamentary freedom by the action of Grattan and the Volunteers, and wonderful the material prosperity which that change brought in the shortlived existence of the independent Irish Legislature, there lay in the apparent benefit the deadly seeds of national poison, as in the fabled gift of Dejanira to Hercules, the poisoned shirt of the monster whom he had slain. Ireland was honeycombed with rotten boroughs when the legislative independence of the Parliament was wrested from Britain, and in these plague-spots in her system was bred the deadly virus that was after a few years of freedom to terminate her career as a self-governing nation. Irishmen of to-day who may feel elated at the prospect of the change now proposed by the British Premier and his Cabinet would do well to study carefully the history of the events in Ireland that led to the extinction of the Parliament won by Grattan and the Volunteers and hailed with such pæans of oratory and patriotic ardor as then thrilled the long-enslaved nation. That history is one of the most useful chapters in the whole world's volume. The grand defect in the new situation created by the triumph of Grattan lay in the fact that it was unable to create a Cabinet responsible to the Irish Parliament, as the English Cabinet was to the Westminster one. Another circumstance unfavorable to the success of any practical attempt to reform the hopeless political situation as to Parliamentary government was the existence of a law forbidding the holding of meetings for political deliberation, and known as the Convention Act. This odious law, which was entirely unknown in England, remained in force in Ireland, it may be remarked, down to about thirty years ago, and was used in O'Connell's time frequently to prevent the holding of meetings in furtherance of the movement for Catholic emancipation.

At this critical period there was dissension in the ranks of the Volunteers over the question of a Parliamentary Reform Act for Ireland, in accord with one which had been enacted for England. Those who were at the head of the movement in Ireland saw that without the coöperation of the Irish Catholics it would be hopeless or futile to move for a reformed Parliament for Ireland. Flood and the Bishop of Derry drew up a Reform Bill for Ireland, but it contained no proposals for the admission of Catholics to the franchise; and so there was no enthusiasm for the passage of the bill on their part. On the other hand, the members of the Irish House of Commons, who were placemen, pensioners or recipients of secret service money from Pitt's corruption fund to the extent of two-thirds of their number, looked at the proposals of the bill with

all the horror of such virtue as animates that class of moralists in similar political crises.

In an address presented by the several Volunteer corps of Ulster to their commander-in-chief, the Earl of Charlemont, it was hinted that it would be necessary to call in the aid of the Catholics if the tyranny of an aristocratic class was to be curbed. Charlemont did not, however, think the time opportune. Although himself a most liberal and tolerant man as to religion, he believed it would only delay that abrogation of the Penal Code which every thoughtful man among the Protestant minority believed to be inevitable, if the country was ever to be happy and prosperous. Charlemont was anxious to have the proposal to hold a National Congress adopted, and he believed that to raise the religious issue at such a juncture would be fatal to the success of the scheme. But neither the idea of emancipation nor that of a National Congress was welcome to the Government, and when Mr. Riley, High Sheriff of Dublin county, called a meeting of freeholders for the purpose of selecting and instructing delegates to such a convention, the Irish Attorney General was instructed to proceed against him in the King's Bench by way of "attachment." The prosecution succeeded in getting the Judges—for there was no jury recognized in such methods of procedure—easily to agree in finding the Sheriff guilty of contempt in summoning such a gathering, and passing sentence of a week's imprisonment on the bold offender and fining him in a small amount. The Government, finding that the move was successful, resolved to try it in other places, to prevent the holding of assemblies as called for by Sheriffs in Roscommon and Leitrim; and the magistrates who had signed the resolutions adopted in these counties were prosecuted as well as the Sheriffs, and both the printers and publishers of such newspapers as had printed the resolutions were included in the indictments. It was not without some apprehension of a reverse that the Government had resorted to the procedure, because although the power of the Judges to prevent public assemblies by writs of "contempt" and putting men in prison without trial was recognized by law, it was rarely resorted to for fear of arousing popular wrath. The Volunteers were still arrayed with their arms ready in the various armories, and a roll of the drum could assemble the hosts in very brief time. Despite the arbitrary action of the Government, the promoters of the National Congress movement succeeded in their design, and a large body of delegates assembled in Dublin in October, 1784. But as it was found to be incomplete in point of representation, it was determined to declare it adjourned, after passing a resolution in favor of the demand for a measure of

Parliamentary reform. The delay in the movement was eagerly seized upon by the secret enemies of Ireland in the British counsels. In religious divisions and sectarian hatred the evil mind of Pitt beheld at once the means whereby he could wrest back the advantage which the cannon and drums of the Volunteers had wrung from the enfeebled hand of Britain. Having perceived the means, he had not the slightest compunction in utilizing them step by step in the development of his secret plan to overthrow the temple of Parliamentary Independence which Grattan and Charlemont and the other leaders of the Volunteer movement had so laboriously reared.

The first excuse for Pitt to begin the execution of his fell design was the appearance of secret society emissaries in the County Kilkenny. They induced the wretched rack-rented peasantry to join in midnight attacks on the abodes of landlords, agents and bailiffs, disguised and swathed in night clothes; hence they were known everywhere as Whiteboys. A good many had previously been formed in Ulster, under the names of "Hearts of Steel," "Peep o' Day Boys" and other fantastic designations. Their purpose was quite different from that of the Whiteboys—it was mainly sectarian. The country around Kilkenny was the scene of many cruel depredations by bands of these desperate men, bailiffs and land agents being usually the objects of their vengeance against the landlords who oppressed them. The wicked folly of these outrages was strongly condemned by Dr. Troy, the then Bishop of Ossory, in a letter to the clergy of his diocese; and as a result the reign of the Whiteboys was not very long in the Kilkenny Diocese; but they sprang up in many other places outside—notably Tipperary and Meath. In Westmeath, later on, the system was firmly and widely rooted, under another name—that of Ribbonmen, and it was not finally uprooted there until about forty years ago. But brief as its existence was in Kilkenny, it gave Pitt the opportunity to introduce the virus of sectarian animosity into the councils of the Irish patriots in many places, particularly in Ulster, and when later on he followed up that success with the more deadly one of sending large numbers of English Orangemen from Lancashire and other countries into Ulster to organize the Protestant inhabitants into secret lodges, with oaths binding members to wage war to the death upon the Catholic population, the seed was sown for that grand coup he had in mind—an armed rebellion by a people, disarmed but desperate, and the destruction of the system of Parliamentary government by Irishmen in Ireland itself.

The British policy in Ireland, at that melancholy epoch, was dominated by two cardinal ideas, namely, the maintenance of the

Protestant ascendency, in the concrete form of a duality of visible things, in the shape of an Established Protestant Church and a landed aristocracy owning the greater part of the soil by virtue of conquest and confiscation. The Established Church was also founded on the same iniquitous basis. Even the most fatuous among the ascendency class could not fail to be persuaded that such a social condition had not the quality of permanency inherent in it. Many conscientious members of the ascendency class worked strenuously for the principle of equal rights in the franchise, in the professions, in the army and navy, for Catholics; and this generous tendency was one of the reasons why Pitt decided to bring about a condition that under the name of union would make for perpetual discord and disunion. "I will soon set down the pegs that make this music," is the side remark Iago makes when noting the happiness that reunion has brought to his dusky master and his bride on the pier at Cyprus. Iago of the poet's imagination was only a petty villain, as compared with William Pitt of the reality, in political chicane. The commercial and industrial conditions and the fiscal policy arising therefrom in the two islands differed so materially that he could take advantage of the sentiment in regard to both, as a controlling influence in the game that he contemplated playing, if not a paramount one. The British manufacturers at that period clung to the policy of protection for native industry, while the Irish ones, at the same time, demanded free trade in the importation of raw materials and goods partly manufactured; and this opposition of interests played a very large part in bringing about the Volunteer movement and its outcome, the declaration of Parliamentary independence. One of Pitt's pet measures was a treaty of commerce between England and Ireland, and the draft of one was drawn up between Mr. Orde, the Chief Secretary, and certain Commissioners representing Irish industrial interests. Eleven resolutions based upon this draft were submitted to both Parliaments for discussion. They were in their effect more favorable to England than Ireland, yet the British employers and workpeople regarded them in quite a different light and made so loud a clamor over them all over the country that the Prime Minister had to ask for leave to amend the bill by inserting three propositions which in effect reëstablished the tyranny of Poyning's Law over Irish commerce and laid down limits of the seas beyond which it should not be allowed to travel in search of trade expansion. When the bill thus mauled and panniered with handicaps on Irish trade came back to Dublin from Westminster, the Irish Government could not succeed in getting a majority strong enough to support it in the division lobbies, and so Mr. Orde, with much

chagrin, allowed it to die a natural death after the first reading. Richard Brinsley Sheridan opposed the bill, although his great colleague, Edmund Burke, favored it. Sheridan saw in it the germs of the sinister thing it was intended to foreshadow—a union with England, and said regarding its purpose and the method of its introduction: "Ireland, newly escaped from harsh trammels and severe discipline, was treated like a high-mettled horse, hard to catch; and the Irish Secretary was sent back to the field to soothe and coax him with a sieve of provender in one hand and a bridle in the other." Sheridan was as keen in his prescience as he was apt in his metaphors. He could plainly perceive what we call "the nigger in the woodpile."

From the first hour of the proclamation of Ireland's rejection of British leading strings the busy brains of Pitt had been at work weaving new excuses for inveigling the liberated country in schemes that would giving excuses for piling heavy financial burdens on her shoulders, and she was soon staggering under her load. On the day of her renunciation of British supremacy her national debt was barely four million pounds, and when Mr. Pitt had worked out his bloody plan for her recapture he made her debt stand at twenty-one millions more. One of the chief agencies by which this enormous burden was brought about was the extension of the Pension List to Ireland and the inclusion of Ireland in the war debt of the British Empire—a most iniquitous piece of tyranny, since Ireland had no interest in the matters for which wars were waged and no voice in deciding questions of war or peace in British counsels. Grattan was intensely bitter in his demur to many of the pensions on the list and the persons and purposes for whom and which they were placed there. But to John Philpot Curran went most of the honors of a debate, the most able, fierce and scarifying that ever was heard in any Parliamentary assembly. He said, referring to the motley crowd of domestic and foreign vampires that were put on the list as objects of the royal bounty:

"This polyglot of wealth, this museum of curiosities, the pension list, embraces every link in the human chain; every description of men, women and children, from the exalted excellence of a Hawke or Rodney to the debased situation of the lady who humbleth herself that she may be exalted. But the lessons it inculcates form its greatest perfection; it teaches that sloth and vice may eat that bread which virtue and honesty may starve for after they had earned it. It teaches the idle and dissolute to look up for that support which they are too proud to stoop to earn. It directs the minds of men to an entire reliance on the ruling power of the State, that feeds the ravens of the royal aviary, that cry continually

for food. It teaches them to imitate those saints on the pension list that are like the lilies of the field—they toil not, neither do they spin, and yet are arrayed like Solomon in all his glory. In fine, it teaches a lesson, which indeed they might have learned from Epictetus, that it is sometimes good not to be over-virtuous; it shows that in proportion as distresses increase the munificence of the Crown increases also; in proportion as our clothes are rent the royal mantle is extended over us."

Despite the scathing reasoning of Curran and many other politicians of the first rank, the Pension Bill and the Place Bill—one equally corrupt in its intent and scope and operation—passed the Houses of Parliament, supported, strangely enough, by all the eloquence of Henry Grattan, and were acceded to by the Viceroy. This acquiescence did little credit to Grattan's perspicuity. If he could have foreseen how deadly the Place Bill could be to that independence of the Irish Parliament which he had labored like Hercules to bring about, it is safe to say he never would have taken the stand he did on that sinister measure.

William Pitt now began to improve the advantage he had gained by the passing of the Place Bill and the Pension Bill, by applying its fruit methodically and practically. He had secured the means whereby to *corrupt,* and he lost no time in beginning the work so necessary to the success of his grand scheme—a Legislative Union. His first important step was the granting of the elective franchise to "forty-shilling freeholders," without specifying any religious persuasion. This meant qualified emancipation for Catholics, inasmuch as nearly all such poor persons belonged to the Catholic faith. On a petition presented to the Irish Parliament in 1792 the proposal to grant the franchise to Catholics was rejected by 208 votes to 23. Next year, when Lord Westmoreland was Viceroy and Pitt's corruption fund was being utilized, the proposal to grant the franchise to the forty-shilling freeholders was carried by a big majority. Mr. Pitt's finesse in this proceeding was Machiavellian in its cunning. He wished to exasperate the Catholics by having their enemies triumph in the first fight, and he succeeded. Then he desired the Catholics to win when the second one came on, and he succeeded, but at the cost of Protestant respect. Both parties felt contempt for him when he won, but he did not care. He was playing to create religious animosity, and he succeeded only too well.

If the palm for political chicanery must be given to William Pitt in regard to his Irish policy, Lord Clare must be assigned the first honors for shameless tergiversation. He spoke almost ferociously on the proposal to give Catholics votes in 1792, saying

it would be a breach of the Coronation Oath and destructive to Church and State to do so; and the following year he both spoke and voted to let them have the franchise! The concession inflamed the minds of the extreme Protestant party and paved the way for the next step in the dark game of "Divide et impera" that Pitt was now playing—the importation of the Lancashire Orangemen and the organization of the secret lodges in Ulster in 1795. To offset this move came the hint to some understrappers to wink at the arrival of French revolutionary agents and allow them to sow the seed of rebellion or Jacobinism in Catholic Ireland. Lord Fitzwilliam, an amiable and wealthy Irish landlord, was sent over as Viceroy to replace Lord Westmoreland. He took immediate steps to inaugurate a liberal and generous regime in Ireland and emancipate the Catholics from every restriction, but to his consternation he found himself outwitted and foiled by the Machiavellian English Minister. He had become a popular idol in Ireland, and at the height of his popularity both he and the people were stunned by the announcement of his recall. As the keen historian, Barrington, puts the case, "the day Lord Fitzwilliam arrived peace was proclaimed throughout Ireland; the day he quitted it she prepared for insurrection." Secret drilling became the order of the day (or rather the night) in almost every county, from the Giant's Causeway to Cape Clear. Lord Carhampton, Commander-in-Chief of all the British forces in Ireland, found the conduct of the English Prime Minister, in ordering him to take measures to goad the people into a premature insurrection, by means of the lash, the pitch cap and "free quarters" for soldiers, so open and shameless, that he resigned his position. General Abercrombie, his successor, after telling the Government that the British army in Ireland was a terror to everybody but the enemy—that is, the French—also resigned, since he was powerless to check the Reign of Terror which Orangemen, Yeomanry, Hessians and regulars had inaugurated. Then, goaded to madness, the wretched unarmed peasants rose in fury and hurled themselves with rude weapons, pikes and scythes, upon the best armed troops in the world. The sanguinary story need not be gone over. All the world knows what ensued. The single County of Wexford fought with a valor so desperate and indomitable that ere the unequal conflict had terminated there were no fewer than 160,000 troops within its confines, while the whole countryside was strewn with the corpses of the brave men who stood up against the hirelings of Pitt—and many of their wives and daughters had died fighting beside them. The unequal struggle was soon ended, and when the County Wexford and a large part of Ulster were drenched with the blood of the patriots

and the whole country outside was quivering with horror and affright, the heartless contriver of the butchery proceeded to unfold the intention which had animated the ghastly proceeding—a plan for the Legislative Union of Great Britain and Ireland. His emissaries in Ireland, Lord Clare and Castlereagh, took the necessary steps to bribe the members of the House of Commons with money and titles and to bully and intimidate those who could not be bought or cajoled. These measures were effectual, and so the year 1800 saw the end of Ireland as an independent nation, for the time being, after eighteen years of remarkable success in controlling her own affairs as a nation.

The cost of the military operations for the suppression of the revolt in Ireland was six million pounds, and this sum was charged up against Ireland's separate account, on the principle of Brennus' 'woe to the conquered."

The central injustice of the arrangement miscalled the Union, since it is in practice an Absorption and an autocratic despotism, is the fact that the transaction had the effect of making Ireland bear a proportional share of the enormous load of the National Debt of Great Britain, after the Parliament of Ireland was no longer to be reckoned with in the balancing of accounts between the respective parties to the pact. The financial arrangements proposed in Mr. Asquith's plan to remedy the injustice of the Union are the most interesting and important sections of the measure. They are roughly outlined thus:

The bill provides that the questions to be excluded from the control of the Irish Parliament are the Crown, the army and the navy, imperial affairs, the Irish land purchase and the Old Age Pensions and National Insurance Acts, the Irish Constabulary, the post office savings bank and public loans in addition to those excluded by the Home Rule Bill of 1893, which left the Customs under the control of the Imperial Government.

The collection of all taxes is to remain in the imperial service, and they will be paid into the Imperial Exchequer, which is to pay over to the Irish Exchequer an amount equivalent to the expenditure on Irish services at the time of the passing of the Act.

An additional sum of $2,500,000 is to be paid to Ireland the first year, and this will diminish by $250,000 yearly until it is reduced to $1,000,000.

The postal services are to be handed over to Ireland. The Irish Parliament is to have power to reduce or to discontinue the imperial taxes excepting the income tax and the stamp and estate duties. It will also have power to alter the excise duties; but, except in the case of beer and spirits, it is debarred from adding to the

customs duties anything which will give a greater increase than ten per cent.

We must expect a stiff fight in committee over the details of this complicated scheme of finance. That Ireland has been unjustly dealt with by the operation of the amalgamation called the Union is a very mild way of describing her case. She has been robbed to the verge of national bankruptcy. By the process of legerdemain in dealing with imperial as well as local chargeability, successive British Governments since the Union have kept piling on annual excess charges until the gross total approaches the billion mark. The Childers Commission of 1896 estimated Ireland's contribution in excess of her just share, for 1894 only, at $14,000,000, and it now approaches $20,000,000. This excess since the Union was estimated by Lord MacDonnell at seventeen billion dollars, "an empire's ransom." The committee of seven experts—only two of whom are Irishmen—whom the Government appointed last year to inquire into the financial relations of the two countries with regard to the drafting of the present Bill have unanimously declared in favor of Irish control of Customs and Excise and in general of Irish fiscal independence.

The iniquitous means by which Ireland's public expenditures were swelled out, in utter disproportion to her size, her population and her legitimate needs, had their roots in the Place Bill. An army of officials and sinecurists was thereby created. As an illustration, the writer knew a gentleman who for sixty years held the post —almost a sinecure one—of Stamp Commissioner. When he retired, it was on a pension of half his salary (£600 a year); and his eldest son was immediately appointed his successor. He lived many years, too, the result being that the Irish public was paying for about a hundred years to one family a yearly sum that would be sufficient to pay the salaries of half a dozen clerks, any one of whom would be quite competent to discharge the duties connected with the handing out of stamps and the taking in of money for them. No such distension of the public charges was ever attempted in Great Britain. Mr. John E. Redmond, M. P., shows in *McClure's Magazine* how Ireland's apparent deficit in its contributions to the Imperial Exchequer was worked out since the Act of Union. His analysis is searching. This is its kernel:

"The total civil government of Scotland (with practically the same population) was in 1806 £2,477,000, or $12,385,000. The cost of similar government in the same year in Ireland was £4,547,000, or $22,735,000. Ireland's judicial system costs £200,000, or $1,000,000, a year more than the Scotch. The Irish police force costs exactly three times what the police of Scotland costs. The

number of officials in Scotland is 963, with salaries amounting to £311,000, or $1,555,000. The number of officials in Ireland is 4,539, with salaries amounting to £1,412,520, or $7,062,600. Per head of the population, the cost of the present government of Ireland is twice that of England, and is far higher than that of Norway, Holland, France, Denmark, Portugal, Sweden, Italy, Spain, Roumania, Bulgaria, Greece, Belgium, Switzerland, Austria-Hungary, Germany or Russia. In other words, Ireland, probably the poorest country in Europe, pays more for her government than any other nation. The secret of the inefficiency and extravagance is identical, namely, the fact that it is a government not based upon the consent, but maintained in actual opposition to the will of the governed."

It has been stated that Ireland is now being treated with extraordinary generosity in the financial proposals of the Asquith Bill. Mr. Redmond's comparisons do not bear out the verdict. The "generosity" would appear to be akin to the process called "feeding a dog with a piece of his own tail."

Mr. Thomas Lough, M. P., who was chairman of the Commission on Financial Relations under the Salisbury Government, found that Ireland was being robbed, under the juggling system adopted since the Union, to the extent of two and a half million pounds sterling—and that was twenty years ago—golden years for the British parties to the compact, wretched ones for the defrauded.

We note by the latest Irish exchanges that Mr. Thomas Sexton, former member of Parliament for Waterford, has just retired from the post of managing director of the leading Irish paper, "The Freeman's Journal." While he was in Parliament he often rendered effective service in matters in which questions of economy and finance were involved. There ought to be no reason now why he should not seek reëlection to the Westminster Parliament, where his fine actuarial skill might be advantageously utilized in the forthcoming debates on the committee stages of the Asquith Bill. He could easily get a seat if he wished to reënter the service of his country. The suggestion is worth some consideration.

John J. O'Shea.

Philadelphia.

THE INCONSISTENCY OF THE MATERIALIST—A SUMMER DAY'S DISCUSSION.

A FOREWORD.

WE HASTEN to disclaim our full share of responsibility for either the conduct or the arguments of the disputants in the following pages. True, we conjured them up one fine summer season, from forth the swarm of creatures of the mind, and set ourselves to record whatever should seem worth while writing out of their wordy wars. It was during that dreamy time when pens grow slack and wits begin to wander—and we had not gotten far into the ensuing pages when we began to realize with some pain that neither of our characters was behaving quite as an ideal and docile character should. Dr. Edwards, whom we had taken on his first appearance to be a mild, considerate and persuasive man, was growing far too dictatorial, too cocksure and vehemently disputatious (a thing which, alas! often happens even when one has a righteous cause!) and his speeches were sometimes so unconscionably long that his luckless antagonist would be sure to be half bewildered by the time it came his turn to speak.

Dr. Doone, on the other hand, betrayed a certain lack of definite opinions and a disposition to dodge and tack and waver, which (however well such qualities in him may hold the mirror up to nature) one would rather not see in a man who stands for the great and unhappily growing tribe of "sturdy unorthodox."

Summer leisure gave us no heart, however, for wrangles with rebellious shadows—and so we heard them out and let them have their say, pretty much as each one chose. When all is said and done, their worst defects may be found to have a certain air of nature about them. And if at times they show some personal bias (for two long lifetimes stretch behind our stage's door), or if they seem to slight some argument or overlook some phase of their extensive subject, let us remember that they are, after all, only two physicians in friendly chat, and not disputants upon a studied theme or champions in any formal trial of logic.

What they suggest, far more than what they say, will, we trust, prove helpful to the gentle reader. One more remark, and that not the least important, before our little creaky curtain rises once for all.

The speeches of Dr. Doone are, we may say in general, the more closely copied from nature in proportion as they grow more wild and strange. Where they seem to touch the very climax of un-

likeliness they have been taken almost verbatim from among the fragments of reported or remembered talk!

Let us sketch with a hurried stroke or two the mise en scène of this simple drama. We are on the deep and vine-embowered veranda of a cozy cottage on Narragansett Bay. The salty savor of the ocean blows cool upon us, and its waves, always rude and boisterous on this rocky coast, make incessantly a pleasant and murmurous splashing on the shore. Two men have come out into the air to smoke. That brisk, lean, eager-looking man leaning on the veranda railing is Dr. Charles Spencer Edwards, surgeon-in-chief to St. Anselm's Hospital, New York. The square-jawed, clean-featured fellow in the rocker is Dr. John Emory Doone, of the Rockford Institute.

Dr. Doone is deep in the pages of a medical journal. Presently he turns to his companion, who has been watching his eager absorption with an amused smile. "By Jove, Charlie," says he, "you may smile, but this *is* interesting. Listen here: 'Dr. Thomas Bradford Winslow, the dean of the medical profession in New York city, has just put the crown on his noble toils in behalf of humanity by donating nearly half a million dollars, the earnings of his busy lifetime, to the founding of a tuberculosis hospital in Bronx borough. The records of human service can scarcely point to a nobler example than this. After a lifetime spent in the most fruitful and honorable effort in behalf of humankind, the venerable doctor has ensured that his work shall live and prosper after him —the noblest work which the crash of dogmas and systems has left us—the work of ministering to the needs and sufferings of nature's lord and masterpiece—man.'"

Dr. Doone paused and glanced upward for approval. "Hasn't that the genuine ring about it, Charlie?" said he with enthusiasm. "I suppose you won't like that bit about the 'crash of dogmas,' but setting that aside, is there anything on earth so noble, so worthy of a man's best toil and pains as the medical profession? What are you smiling at? Confound you, isn't that interesting and inspiring?"

"Very interesting, indeed, and very inspiring. But you may thank your stars, you materialists," said Dr. Edwards, puffing very gently on his cigar, "that you have, all of you, the blessed gift of inconsistency." And he looked over at his friend with an expectant twinkle in his eye.

"The gift of inconsistency," repeated Doone, wrinkling his forehead. "Well, I like that; what do you mean by that now?" "I mean, my dear fellow," resumed Dr. Edwards, settling himself

comfortably in a chair and tilting his chin a little, to favor exposition, "I mean that it is a blessed thing for you all that you don't follow your principles out to their logical conclusion—that you happily stop a little short of trying to act on what you hold by, theoretically—or else what a pretty pickle you'd all be in!" Dr. Doone sat up with emphasis and bristled a little. Next to what he called his liberal and strictly scientific principles, it was his chief boast that he was an eminently logical man and rigidly consistent, and this blunt assertion to the contrary acted on him with an unpleasant stimulus.

"You outrageous controversialist!" he cried at the smiling and complacent Edwards. "Prove that against me and I'll grant all the assumptions of the vitalists. You rascal, you; you're spoiling for a dispute."

"I am, I own it," said Dr Edwards amiably; "it is the one thing I need, John, to put the finish on a delightful week. And when I see you there, poring with such solemnity over that absurd materialistic sheet and gulping down its ponderous inconsistencies—by Jove, I feel the proper moment has arrived to floor you."

Doone laughed. He and Edwards had been close friends at the medical school, then had drifted apart a bit, while each was climbing high in his own specialty, until now they had met and renewed their old familiarity again at a friend's cottage on Narragansett Bay. They felt intimate enough to let their friendship bear the strain of an argument—but neither was quite sure of the other's philosophical stand. It sometimes needs a holiday to bring such thoughts to the surface—men seldom discuss their abstract principles when they are in the thick of the concrete businesses of life.

"I'll tell you what, John," Dr. Edwards continued, looking at him meditatively. "What do you say, in real earnest, if you and I thrash out some of these questions in a friendly way during these quiet morning hours on the veranda?"

"I'm more than willing," answered the other, shaking himself up to attention. "I'm all in a wonder what you really think or believe, and how you can square your dogmas with your science. Inconsistent man. Good heavens! What do you call yourself!"

"This materialism of yours," continued Edwards, not noticing the retort. "Did you ever consider to what a level it should logically reduce the medical profession?"

"What level? It leaves it the noblest of Vocations."

"From the standpoint of sentiment—perhaps. But, John, suppose we are, as you think, mere laboratories of chemistry and physics—complex machines—then how does our noble vocation differ, for example—well—from that of the veterinary?"

"How?" snorted Doone. "Every way. The object of our healing art is man—man, the one noble thing in the universe. We heal him, body and mind. Where a century ago he writhed in helpless pain or died like a dog, hopeless and agonized, we with our skillful knife or subtle medicament rescue him, snatch him from agony, make his body wholesome and his pulses calm. And you compare the art which ministers to the health of this lord of creation to the low trade of dosing horses? Shame on you! Their objects are as different as the poles!"

"Very well said," answered Edwards; "but now you're not speaking according to the formularies of materialism. Translated into these, your rhapsody should be something as follows: 'The object of our art is man—man, a curious jumble of complicated physical and chemical phenomena—a ghastly deceit born of chance reactions, which produce the sad illusions of consciousness, of identity and responsibility, where really there is but a helter-skelter of changing atoms, a specious rottenness, crumbling to decay. Where a century ago this unseemly thing fell apart to clean elements, unhindered, we, other fortuities, by a blind development of the same queer chance, dig in our haphazard blades or pour our drug mixtures, and sometimes stave off decay and dissolution, and prolong the melancholy galvanism called life—a little dance of atoms more. With the other equally queer jumble called the horse the veterinary does the same. Behold our dear profession!" And Dr. Edwards leaned back and breathed a bit after his exertions. "Confound it!" said Doone. "You paint the thing too black. A man is a great deal finer thing than a horse, even materially speaking." "There's just your inconsistency," said the smiling Edwards. "Granted materialism—that all things are merely the same matter differently arranged, and there's no such thing as finer or coarser. What's your standard of comparison—complexity? But that's merely making more of a greater chance disorder; that's sentiment, not science. Take things to your laboratory, put aside all prejudice and feeling, boil the human body and the horse's body—or a fly's, for that matter—to their last element, and you find them much the same. The fine arrangement—the complex harmony—what are they but accidents and by the way. The one reality with you is matter—and it is much the same in everything."

"Now stop a bit," said Doone. "What would you say to the monistic theory? Suppose that *all* matter has its own bit of consciousness and purposefulness, in a latent state, ready to flower out into the full nobility of human nature, so soon as it comes into proper contact and relation with other similar units in the great harmonious whole we call a man?"

"Do you bring that argument seriously, John?" asked Edwards, smiling, "or is this a playful digression? You are too sensible a man to postulate a million million souls so as to get rid of one. But leaving aside the fearful contradictions which rise up to damn that wildly fanciful theory, at best it really does not help at all to excuse this glaring inconsistency of materialism. For even granting the monistic theory, all matter is still equally noble, or, if you will, equally degraded. The phosphates in your brain and nerves are really no better and no lordlier now than when they lay inert in the tissues of the fish you ate last fortnight—the mass of matter that we call a man is really no more dignified nor glorious a being now, in the full heyday of his genius, beauty, youth, than he will be half a century hence when he lies—horrid reflection!—in some gloomy vault of a neglected graveyard, hid from the wholesome air. No! no! my dear fellow, your materialists may squirm and wince and build new theories, but so long as everything is matter to them they will have a heavy task indeed to justify the much-harped-on nobleness of man."

"But then there's the long result of Evolution," said Doone, "to explain and justify the nobleness and preëminence of man. He is the last and choicest product of the long processes of nature. He is the fruitage of the years, the ripe result of time. Isn't all that a patent of nobility?"

"A patent of nobility? That all depends on what these long processes have led to, my dear fellow. What, from the standpoint of the out-and-out materialist, has been the upshot of all this age-long preparation? Merely a mass of actions and reactions, a greater complexity, a more amazingly intricate and involved haphazard and confusion. Is the mere complexness, intricacy and the unstable balance of a thousand strange and delicate coincidences, which in your theory evolve a man, anything to rave or wonder at? From simple and stable things to more complex and unstable compounds, last to the most complex and unstable of them all, which we call a man—then by retrogressive stages of swift corruption back to the simpler elements—behold the sum total in the individual instance of materialistic Evolution. It is merely, if one may say so, the process of corruption turned the other way—a slow and complex upbuilding—to pave the way for a sudden and pitiful collapse. But why should we worship man, the medial stage of this dreary process? Why call him the end and flower of evolution? He is a passing stage—the point of highest complexity. The real conclusion of all this dance of atoms is simplicity and corruption once again. The universe tends to become uniform once more as it was in the beginning—a final simplicity, through corruption,

and not the complex stage called man, is the proper goal of materialistic evolution."

"Well," said Doone, "what of it? Can't we admire man, 'the complex stage,' as you call him, while he lasts?"

"What are we to admire anything?" smiled Edwards. "*We* are that complex stage ourselves! We are mere transitions, melting views, dissolving pictures, compounds that vanish as they rise. And if we, transient jumbles that we are, had any right to admire anything, what should we find to admire in the queer freaks that matter is playing all around us? If one sticks to blind fortuity, as well admire the inarticulate gurglings of an idiot's frenzy or the tumbling about of rubbish in a dust heap when the winds are high——"

"But the order, the design, the marvelous adaptation of part to part!" said Doone.

"Order!—design! but what are these to a materialist? Who ordered? Who designed them? You postulate a creator then? Or if matter itself does all, then matter itself is a God. You become a pantheist."

"I see you have the better of me at metaphysics," declared Doone, plaintively. "I confess it; I am no logician."

"John, that's a common plea with you materialists, I notice," said Edwards, "and it seems to me a very flimsy one. Doesn't it occur to you that the reason we get the better of you in logic so often is not that we are better trained in subtleties, but rather that the logic of the thing 's really on our side? And why follow logic and common-sense enever it suits one's convenience and leave its guidance just where it turns us toward unwelcome truths? What if a man should say to you: 'You seem to have the symptoms on your side. I can't refute your diagnosis, but I distrust all symptoms just here—I have fixed views of my own about the case, which I prefer to keep!'"

Doone laughed and threw away his half-consumed cigar. "Perhaps we'd better sleep on this," said he. "My brain may be clearer to-morrow morning. You've gotten me interested anyhow, Charlie, and if I can't answer you, I think I'll own it. Meantime, let's go inside."

II.

"I have an answer for you, Charlie boy," said Dr. Doone, amiably, the next morning, as they met on the veranda. "The reason that materialism seems so coarse and repulsive in your eyes is that you lose sight of human feeling. Suppose we are only jumbles of atoms in the eyes of Science. At least in our own hearts we

know that we are princes of creation and the wonder of the universe!"

"Oh, heavens!" said Edwards. "What dreadful inconsistency again! Get down to facts, my dear man, and what becomes of all your fine sentiments. What is a noble thought or a lofty ideal according to your dear materialism? Why, it's nothing in the world but a little bunch of atoms in the flabby organism we call a brain, happening to assume some certain form, which causes stimuli in the nerve centres, which gives you the amiable delusion that you have a feeling or a thought. But the true scientific materialist should not hear a word of such nonsense. To him it all comes back to a question of accidental arrangement of brute matter. Into this hideous crucible of confusion he throws all that is lovely and generous and true in life and man. It all boils down to a question—if I may put it crudely—if some microscopic wiggles in divers cells, or, as the layman might describe it, if the stumbling about of a tiny bit of meat in the skull. Heroism, virtue, nobility, character; unselfishness and generosity, courage and kindness—nay, even poetry and music, filial affection, the tenderness of lovers, the fidelity of friends; what are they all according to your horrid theory but a shifting of cells or an oozing of secretions? The noblest act of heroism and devotion that was ever said or sung should consistently seem no better or more admirable to you than the gushing forth of a drop of pepsin in a pig's stomach or the bumping along of red corpuscles through the vessels of a frog!"

"Well, what of it?" said Doone, somewhat testily; "we are beings of sentiment, too."

"My dear fellow, as I said, there is just the height of your happy inconsistency. With a theory which should destroy the last vestige of feeling, virtue and honor and make a man a swinish brute, a stout denier and despiser of everything noble and humane, you insist on keeping every convenient sentiment and virtue. Why, you are really living on the vitality and clothed with the seemliness and dignity of the very system you most affect to destroy and supplant—the noble system of Christianity.

"Where did you get the ideas you make much of—the dignity of man, the nobility of service, the sweet reasonableness of altruism? From the believers in an immortal soul, in a life beyond the animal. And when you have built up a theory which denies the very foundations and postulates of all these noble things, with a happy inconsistency, as I say, you calmly keep the fruit when you have blasted and undermined the very roots of the tree!"

"We have our theories, too—dozens of them," said Doone stoutly.

"I'm not much for that kind of thing myself, but if I had my library here I could show you copious explanations—books on books full of them!"

"Exactly, my dear fellow," answered Edwards; "you have many theories—choose any one you will—they all agree dismally in this, that they base noble structures on a rotten foundation. They start with the assumption that man is a mere congeries of matter and then build up moving descriptions of his vast preëminence from what they know of human dignity as it is. In other words, they assume human nature to be a degraded accident—which it is not—and then describe it as a very paragon of creation—which it is. They are right in saying that man is supremely noble, but wrong in ascribing that supreme nobility to a mere hodge-podge of nerves and blood."

"Theories or no theories," said Doone, half to himself, "man is a noble being. It certainly seems that the materialistic idea does fail to respect and account for his dignity and distinction," he continued. "But why, then, are so many materialists—and notably many members of our own great profession—such sincere admirers of mankind and earnest philanthropists, too?"

"Precisely, as I said before, because of their happy inconsistency. If they follow their theory, whither would it lead them? To the most sodden selfishness and contempt of the race and disregard of all human need and suffering. For if there is one quality of matter which is constant and invariable, it is its utter subjection to fixed and inevitable laws. Isn't that so?" Doone nodded, not very energetically, foreseeing another unpleasant conclusion.

"These fixed laws, then—chemical, physical, what you will, must govern all mere matter absolutely," continued Edwards, vigorously, "so that the actions and reactions of the most complex organisms are as necessary and inevitable, as utterly predetermined and completely mechanical, if I may so express it, as the falling of a stone or the sprouting of a seed. Isn't that so?" A reluctant nod again. "Why, then, it follows, don't you see," cried Edwards, gathering impetus, "that the brain and heart of man are no exception to this iron rule—that they, too, act along blind laws and are impelled to inevitable actions and reactions? And if this be so, what a mere empty name is 'philanthropy' and 'humanity' and how foolish it is for an avowed materialist to profess them. Your pity, your will to help and serve, your skilled investigation and assiduous care, are all mere delusions—blind motions of the brain, cell-vibrations, physical secretions—call them what you will, they are absolutely inevitable, perfectly fixed—no more under your control than the motion of the stars. How inconsistent, then, to try and be

philanthropic or helpful if one is a materialist; how foolish, indeed, to try and be anything; both you and the object of your endeavors are blank machines—neither the one nor the other able to do aught but yield to necessary and rigid laws and impulses. How vain, I say, to dream of trying to help any one! There is neither personality to try, nor will to desire, nor intellect to direct—for all these things are deceptions. Nothing is there, at the brain and heart of this seemingly noble humanity of ours, but blood and tissue and nerves, things utterly the play of material and necessary force and law.

"But we *know* we *have* personality, and will and intellect," broke in Doone. "Materialism doesn't deny the phenomena; it merely explains them along scientific lines. I know very well, for instance —I *feel* it, am conscious of it, so to speak—that I can do as I choose and that's surely volition. I know, too, that I can apprehend and measure truth—that's intelligence—and that I am *I* and no one else—that's personality. I admit that—I must admit it. But when I come to explain these things I find nothing in myself to account for them but brain and blood and nerves, physical and chemical forces. Therefore, these things must somehow produce thought and will and personality."

"A marvelous way of reasoning!" cried Edwards. "You notice in yourself spontaneous, free and self-governing powers—you admit their existence—you are forced to it by consciousness. On the other hand, science assures you most emphatically that it is of the very nature of all merely material action, to be fixed, necessary, inevitable. Will you then blindly insist on explaining these phenomena by laws which should produce their very opposite? Free actions produced by necessary laws! How very contradictory and absurd! And you cannot deny, as you have just owned, that you are a free, intelligent personality, because consciousness itself keeps forcing that conclusion on you. So—oh, happy inconsistency again! —you calmly act as a man, while in theory you profess that you are a mere machine!"

"Well, what is a man to do?" said Doone. "The facts are there; we are conscious of a free personality, but the scalpel and microscope find nothing to explain it, but nerve and brain and tissue, though these seem, as you say, quite inadequate to produce the effect. What can one do?"

"Do?" said Edwards. "Make your theory fit the facts instead of forcing the facts to fit your theory. Obviously you push your argument in the wrong direction. You make up your mind, first of all, that there is nothing but matter in the world, and then, of course, every phenomenon in the universe must be the result of blind material forces. But wouldn't it be more scientific to say:

'Here are phenomena—of conscious personality—free volition and so on, which are beyond and above the blind and necessary powers of matter? Therefore, they do *not* proceed from matter, but from something above and beyond!' "

"Confound your logic!" said Doone, looking half-convinced.

"In fact," continued Edwards, "you seem to me to do the very thing for doing which you condemn the mediæval monks and schoolmen. They argued *a priori,* so do you. They sometimes followed an abstract principle or a preconceived idea to unwarranted conclusions—you do worse. For which is farther from the true scientific spirit to say, as some of them did, 'A sphere is the most perfect of forms, therefore the heavenly bodies are all spherical,' or as you do, 'Matter is all there is, therefore mind and volition and personality are all the products of blind material operations?' "

"It does all look pretty inconsistent as you put it, Charlie," said Doone, frowning meditatively, "but this way of thinking is strange to me. You'll have to give me time to work it out. I'll wager you now by to-morrow I'll have some argument or difficulty that will lay you cold."

"Bring it along," said Edwards, laughing; "if it's a new one, I'll vote you a learned degree!"

III.

"By Jove, Charlie," said Dr. Doone, as they met on the porch the following morning, "you have that controversial twinkle in your eye again."

"I'm just longing," said Edwards, smiling briskly, "for the promised argument that was to lay me cold." "Why, really, since you've gotten me on this subject," said the other, "my thinking's been all by sixes and sevens. The fact is, I had never philosophized much on these questions at all. The thing seemed so plain—that all there is to the Universe is matter of some sort or other—that I took it for granted, and I thought every really well-informed man in his heart of hearts must do the same. I own, as you put it, it's an inconsistent thing to hold that theory and yet keep our present feelings and traditions about the nobility of man and the excellence of Philanthropy. But I find I simply can't disentangle it—so there you are!"

"Honestly said!" cried Edwards. "Not many men would have the courage to be so frank. I wouldn't have been, I know, when I was in your state of mind. But do you know, Dr. Doone, I firmly believe that your experience is that of nine-tenths of professed atheists and materialists among the members of our profession? It isn't a question of reasoned conviction with them—it's half

example and half preoccupation. My own case was precisely the same. For a long time, if any one had put to me the objections I have given you, I should probably have made the same answers. I preferred indeed not to talk on such subjects at all, but if I was pushed to it, those were my views. Looking back, I think I can see the precise causes of that mental attitude. The first, and perhaps the strongest, was precisely as you say, that other men, whom I considered wiser than I, held to materialism; the next, that there seemed to be so many difficulties in accepting any other theory; and, finally, there was the intense and continual preoccupation with more urgent and tangible concerns, which made me averse to any theorizing whatever out of medical lines. Did I ever tell you how I came to change my views?"

"No," said Doone, "and I should very much like to hear."

"It was when my daughter Laura died," said Edwards, reminiscently. "I little thought so heavy a grief would bring me so great a good. She was at the flower of her youth—just turned eighteen, and the darling of my heart. Her death came suddenly of cardiac rheumatism and it broke me utterly for a time. And as I stood over her dead body, fresh and lovely as in life, I suddenly thought with horror that according to the materialistic idea this was all there had ever been to that beloved child—a body of flesh and bone, a mass of fibre and nerve—that it needed only a little motion there for my own Laura to open her eyes and speak to me tenderly as of old. My whole being revolted at the thought. 'There is something more in death,' said I to myself, 'than the mere stopping of a machine. Life is more than mere motion, else what had my living Laura been but a meaningless puppet—a galvanized corpse!' I shuddered and turned away. Then I felt my wife's soft touch on my arm. 'Charlie,' said she, tearfully, 'at least here you will not refuse to think that there is a soul.' She, dear woman, had been trying in vain in every way for twenty years to move me from my unbelief—but she succeeded then. I fell on my knees beside that hallowed bier, and unfamiliar prayers came to my lips again, and since that day," he concluded, looking towards his friend, "I have frankly hated the very name of materialism!"

"I see, I see," said Doone, hesitatingly. "Yet to be honest with you, I cannot go so far. There are difficulties in materialism—so are there in most systems—but I still maintain they are not so great nor so glaring as you think. I am not ready for a change of view. I should have to readjust all my theories of life."

"Precisely!" cried Edwards. "I sympathize very deeply with your attitude of mind, but let us go on. I believe if you are once convinced you will make the readjustment."

"I suppose so," said Doone, uncomfortably, and half to himself; "but I am not specially eager for the event."

"We have seen, I think," said Edwards, "that Materialism quite destroys the dignity of man, makes philanthropy, honor, righteousness—in a word, all that is laudable or estimable in human nature, a mere affair of brain and nerves, or to go farther still, a blind, mechanical and inevitable working out of necessary laws of matter. How dreadful and deadening this principle would be if carried logically into all our human activities one shudders to think. But materialists never push the principle so far. With happy inconsistency——" Doone threw up his hands. "You can supply the rest," said Edwards, smiling. "They act as though they were really personal beings endowed with will and mind. But there is another province of human activity in which this same inconsistency appears most opportuntely. Morals, my dear fellow—morals, what would they be if you followed your system to the end?"

"Why," said Doone, "pretty much as they are now, I imagine. We materialists are not such a wicked lot."

"You can hardly be wicked," answered Edwards, "according to your own principles. Resolve the worst possible act into its ultimate terms in the materialistic view and what does it become? An affair of nerve and brain action at most—the excitation of a few irresponsible cells—as harmless and little worthy of censure as the grinding of the digestive organs. Do you hold criminals worthy of blame?" "Why, of—of course, at least in a way," said Doone. "Why should you now—aren't they mere mechanical organisms? Can they help it that their cells go wrong?"

"Why," said Doone, "hardly; but we couldn't run society on any such idea as that you know."

"So you excuse them theoretically and hang them practically—again a very convenient and happy inconsistency. Because to hold them really responsible would undoubtedly ruin your theory, whereas to let them go scot-free would ruin the community at large!"

"You put it rather baldly, I should say," said Doone, a little warmly. "It's very true that the old ideas of moral responsibility and all that have been knocked all askew by deterministic materialism; but we have something better in their place. We have the ethics of evolution to steer by now. The criminal is a degenerate type, a reversal from the onward movement of human evolution toward the ideal. Where we find him putting himself into conflict with the upward trend of the race we seize him and constrain him to move out of the path of progress. If extreme measures are necessary, we put him out of existence. It is all on precisely the

same principle, just as sane, sensible and practical as that on which a gardener plucks up weeds when they threaten to choke his flowers, or better still, on which you would excise a man's appendix when it is misbehaving and threatening to destroy his life."

"My dear fellow," said Edwards, "will you answer me some straightforward questions?"

"Ask away," said Doone with an air of resignation.

"First of all," began Edwards, "do you believe in the conservation of energy and in all that term implies?"

"Of course," answered the other, staring a little.

"Then, what is to be the end at last of all this great cosmic evolution on which you base your newly-furbished ethics?"

"The end? Why, a glorious race of beings—Man at his utmost beauty and perfection of body and of intellect—a sort of earthly heaven, better than the one of which you vitalists dream."

"Stop a bit!" cried Edwards. "I thought you just declared your firm adhesion to the principle of the conservation of energy?"

"Well, what if I did," answered Doone, a little testily. "What in the world has the conservation of energy to do with the apotheosis of man or the goal of evolution?"

"What has it to do with them? Everything," answered Edwards. "Once admit the conservation of energy and one comes to the inevitable and exhilarating conclusion that the goal of organic evolution, and of everything else in the universe, for that matter—sun, moon, stars and planets—is a final condition of uniform rot—dry rot and utter extinction—nothing more! And you and I and all men, past and present, even your future paragons, are only stages by the way."

"Oh, come now," cried Doone; "how do you make that out?"

"It's as simple as two plus two," answered Edwards gayly. "The available energy of the universe is limited. You grant that, I think?" Doone nodded. "It is spending itself quite rapidly," continued Edwards; "that goes without saying. So in some fixed period of time—how long or how short doesn't make much difference to Science—the dance of change will all be over. The available energy of the universe will have been exhausted—a dead level of permanent rest will have been achieved. Behold the goal of evolution. This final and stable permanence, as I pointed out to you in our last talk, not any possible incidental perfection of the chance bundle of reactions and complexities called man, which this evolution tosses up and destroys by the way, is the goal and term of all this evolving, flux and change."

"Well, what then?" said Doone, wrinkling his forehead. "How

does that alter our right on evolutionary grounds to do away with criminals?"

"Only in this far," answered Edwards, pointing an expository finger: "It shows that man is *not* the goal of evolution, but only an incident by the way. Now, you based the right of Society to destroy the criminal on the fact that he was hindrance to the onward march of evolution towards its final goal. I answer, how? The final goal of Evolution is a permanent rest and exhaustion of all natural energies—a sort of physical nirvana of the universe, if one can speak so. How does the criminal hinder that?"

"But he *does* hinder the evolution of human society and of the individual man," said Doone, "so away with him."

"Excuse me for reminding you once more, John, that we are all of us mere incidental complexities, thrown out in the general march of all things towards simplicity and extinction. Why should your peculiar type of fortuitous complexity say to the criminal's type, 'I am to be preferred to you?' You must establish first some superiority over him."

"But it stands to reason," said Doone, looking dazed, "that the criminal is an obstacle to civilization. You wouldn't deny that, surely?"

"It certainly doesn't stand to materialistic reason, John," answered Edwards. "For on what grounds do you damn him? Hasn't he a right to dance out his little day and spend his little handful of vital energy as he chooses as well as you? Isn't he hastening on towards the final crash and extinction as quickly as any one? Isn't he promoting the swift transition to another stage as fast as he can? And what matter is it what this or that fortuity does by the way, whether his way or yours prevails for a little time? The cosmic wheel keeps rolling, the cosmic pot keeps boiling, everything bubbles and simmers merrily along towards the final twilight and extinction which, according to mere materialistic notions, must be at last the end and bourne of all."

"But how do you know that the universe is to remain in that dead level of exhausted energy?" Doone remonstrated. "Why not suppose some new accession of energy—some explosion of hidden and dormant forces—some reënergizing of the cosmic system which may rejuvenate the universe again and set the great, majestic processes of vital evolution ringing once more down the long grooves of change?"

"What then?" cried Edwards. "That only strengthens our argument. If this whole order of things is but an incident in a long chain of disconnected epochs—regalvanizations of the cosmic structure, then in very truth what a trifling incident is man. How

much more absurd to build up a system of ethics on his worth and dignity. How much more inconsistent to dignify and exalt this bubble in the cosmic whirlpool, this gleam on the troubled waters of the seething streams of change!"

Dr. Doone swallowed once or twice and gazed reflectively at the end of his cigar.

"So much for the criminal," continued Dr. Edwards, after some meditative puffs. "But now for the crime. Are any actions really wrong, according to you materialists?"

"Of course!" cried Doone. "Why not?"

"Why not? Why so?" pursued his friend. "Doesn't it all come down after all to a question of chemical and physical actions and reactions? And can there be anything wicked in those?"

"I don't quite catch your point," said Doone doggedly.

"You promise not to get angry now," said Edwards. "Well, then, let's go more into particulars. Now answer me this, for instance—is murder wrong?"

"Wrong? Abominable! What a question! Do you take us for savages?" said Doone, rather hotly.

"Well, now, why should it be?" persisted Edwards earnestly. "Analyze the thing dispassionately in the mere light of your theory. Suppose even that a man should murder his own mother in cold blood—faugh!—the very words stick in my throat!—what would that be, from the materialistic standpoint, but the mere destruction or changing of a chemical and physical compound? Now I challenge your honesty. Answer me strictly along the lines of materialistic theory."

Doone swallowed and coughed. "Why—er—well—er," said he, "but—it would be destroying a very valuable chemical compound!"

Edwards laughed long and loud. "And that's all?" he cried. "Yes, that's all. That's honestly the most that a materialist could say to justify his condemnation of matricide. I spare you further applications. There is no human feeling, however sacred and holy, which one must not consistently abandon if he follows the logic of materialism. The most horrid comparisons are perfectly inevitable and clear. No man could bear to think of, much less to utter, all the dread consequences of these dreary premises. It would be far too painful to our nobler sentiments and conviction to pursue such a line of thought to its unsavory end. And you, a sensible man, and thousands on thousands of other sensible men, hold by such a theory?"

"Now look here, Charlie," said Dr. Doone, straightening up in his chair and looking very much puzzled, "I—I don't believe I'm

much of a materialist as you understand it, after all. I'm an agnostic—a terrible agnostic—that's what I am."

"Do you abandon Materialism, John," said Edwards, "because my 'thirst for controversy,' as you call it, will not be slaked with less?"

"I don't know," said Doone. "All I can say is, I see no answer to your questions and puzzles. Wiser men than I hold to materialism; let them answer you. I'm sure they could."

"My dear fellow," said Edwards, "don't you know in your heart of hearts that the wisest and keenest of them all could do little better than you have done in answering objections like these? They are simply driven to be inconsistent, that is all. If they hold to the theory that everything is matter, they may wriggle and squirm as they choose; they must finally swallow a hundred contradictions, of which I've only hinted at a little part."

"Mysteries, you mean," said Doone. "We can't understand everything."

"No; contradictions, flat, glaring, hideous contradictions. Mysteries are things we can't understand, though we can see they do not involve any inconsistency; but the contradictions of materialism are open and horrid. Imagine one's saying that everything is mere brute matter, moved by necessary laws, and then thinking or maintaining any one or anything to be exalted, virtuous or noble! Virtue and crime, as we were saying before, nobility and villainy, intellect and idiocy, design and confusion, murder and philanthropy should merge into one silly, purposeless dance of dead atoms in brain and nerve. Admit materialism and you should own at once that you are as incapable of anything intelligent, voluntary or human as a beast in the jungle, as a vegetable, as a handful of waterwashed sand!"

There was a lengthy pause while both men followed in silence the current of their thoughts.

"Well, suppose a man does give up the confounded theory," said Doone, at last, "what then? What do you offer in its place? Give me your system, your ideas, and let me see if they are any freer than mine from what you call 'these happy inconsistencies.'"

"I will, John; I will," said Edwards, earnestly, looking at his friend with a new light in his glance, "but not now. Enough for this morning. Let us go inside."

Edward F. Garesche, S. J.

St. Louis, Mo.

INFLUENCE OF GAELIC LITERATURE ON THE IRISH AND ON THE WORLD.

THE influence of Gaelic literature was necessarily twofold in its nature. It moulded—and still moulds—the Irish character, and it shaped and embellished the literature of the world to a far greater extent than is generally conceded.

All real literature springs from the very heart of a people. It is a criterion of the degree of civilization they have attained. It embodies their ideals, their gropings after truth, their hope of an abode of future blessedness, be that abode called Walhalla, or the Happy Hunting Ground, or Moy Mell or Heaven. In its turn it reacts upon those who produced or cherish it, safeguarding those ideals lest, blinded, weakened or disheartened by care and sorrow, or enervated and brutalized by the fairness of time's lilies which "are to-day and to-morrow are cast in the oven," they lose sight of the better world toward which each and all are journeying.

Perhaps no race has had greater need of literature than have the Irish. Naturally high-minded, in love with the good and the beautiful, they have what the French call the defects of their qualities. They are impetuous, impressionable and pleasure-loving, and, undirected, their love of beauty might have degenerated into the pantheistic nature worship which vitiates so much of modern poetry and modern philosophy, or their delicacy of sentiment, crushed beneath the weight of centuries of warfare, followed by centuries of poverty and oppression, might have stiffened into a dull, unimaginative hardness, unsusceptible to the influence of every sentiment unconnected with their own misery. That they have rushed into neither extreme is due primarily to their faith; but that faith owes much to a literature which in its infancy was given into St. Patrick's keeping and became, under his influence, so truly beautiful that, in the words of an old author, the angels of God leaned over the edge of heaven to hear the songs of the Irish bards. That faith owes much to a literature which, its childhood outgrown, waxed strong in the days when Ireland was known the world over as the "Isle of Saints and Scholars."

Fairy tales have furnished the lively imaginations of the Irish with the food they craved; stories once sung by the bards and now repeated about every fireside have kept before them examples of heroic bravery and heroic sanctity; their poems, of a delicacy of sentiment and musical beauty seldom equaled, have helped them rise above the sordidness of their surroundings; the family annals, preserved with loving accuracy, century after century, have con-

stantly reminded them that their ancestors suffered much for faith and country and have sustained their courage for the world over *noblesse oblige.*

Since the days of St. Patrick the Irish have written much and written well. They have studied Holy Scripture, the Fathers of the Church and the pagan classics, as well as their own literature, not wresting these things to their own destruction, but making true knowledge a stepping stone to heaven. The consequence of all this is that the poisonous breath of rationalism which pollutes modern thought spreads no contagion in Ireland. Healthy minds like healthy bodies are immune to disease.

Nor has the influence of Gaelic literature been confined to the island which gave it birth. From the beginning the Irish were wanderers and they carried their literature with them. It was a factor in the intellectual development of many nations. It gave of the music, the joyousness, the humor, the tenderness which characterized it, thereby broadening and sweetening and elevating the whole range of mediæval and modern thought. Though it cannot boast of having produced any world masterpiece, it contributed to more than one and that in divers ways.

It was a poem on Hell written by Brenda, an Irishman, which probably suggested to Dante the outline of his Inferno. Greater glory still—rhyme originated in the alliteration invented by the Gaelic bards. They began with vowel assonance, which in time they completed by the addition of consonantal assonance, and so rhyme was evolved. The first fully rhymed hymns and poems were carried to the Continent by Gaelic missionaries after the invasions of the barbarians had overthrown the already disintegrated Roman Empire and with it the culture of the pagan world, and when the beautiful poetry of Greece and Rome was wrapped in a deathlike slumber awaiting the coming of the Prince in the guise of the Renaissance. In the meantime rhyme was adopted by Europe, never to be disinherited.

Rhyme is the only feature of literature which did not come to us from the East. The specimens we have of the first poetry of Oriental nations, other than the Hebrew, are fine examples of the possibilities of rhythm and the beginnings of meter. As poetry journeyed westward meter became as important as rhythm, and these two beauties differentiated it from prose.

The possibilities of rhyme, that gift of ancient Ireland to the world, are nowhere so strikingly illustrated as in the hymns written in Latin during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and incorporated into the majestic liturgy of the Church. Take, for example, that most perfect of them all, the Dies Irae. Professor Saintsbury

calls it "the greatest of all hymns and one of the greatest of all poems." Written by a Franciscan monk, Thomas of Celano, from purely religious motives, as a model of style it has never been equaled. Saintsbury maintains further that, "After the Dies Irae no poet could say that any effect of poetry was, as far as sound goes, unattainable, though few could hope to equal it, and perhaps no one except Dante and Shakespeare had ever fully done so."

And in modern times rhyme has found favor with writers of every nationality. Milton alone, of the great poets, has condemned it, possibly because no friend of Cromwell's would approve of anything of Irish origin. He called it "the invention of a barbarous age to set of wretched matter and lame meter." Nevertheless, he used it with brilliant effect in his Hymn to the Nativity.

One of the marked characteristics of Gaelic writers is the facility with which they express sentiment. Tenderness of feeling is common to a greater or less degree to all mankind, but many people stammer when they try to express it, others instinctively conceal it. No nation ever possessed this aptitude to as great a degree as the Irish, and it was from them that all others learned what they have of this power. But for Gaelic influence Dante might never have voiced in the Vita Nuova the story of his youthful love, and Walther Von der Vogelweide's exquisite love lyrics had been sung on a lower key. But for it the Sonnets from the Portuguese had frozen in a woman's heart and brain.

In a fine and oft quoted passage Henry Morley boldly develops this or a very similar idea. "The main current of English literature," he says, "cannot be disconnected from the lively Celtic wit in which it has one of its sources. The Celts do not form an entirely distinct part of our mixed population. But for an early, frequent and various contact with the race that in its half-barbarous days invented Ossin's dialogues with St. Patrick and that quickened the Northmen's blood in France, Germanic England would not have produced a Shakespeare."

Their schools furnished the Gaels with a vast field of influence. Beginning with the day of St. Patrick and continuing for several hundred years, the schools flourishing in the shadow of the Irish cloisters were the most famous in the world. As Newman said, "The Celt preceded the Anglo-Saxon, not only in Christianity, but in his cultivation and custody of learning, religious and secular, and again in his zeal for its propagation." And Dollinger asserts that in the sixth and seventh centuries "whilst almost the whole of Europe was devastated by war, peaceful Ireland, far from the invasions of foreign foes, opened to lovers of learning and piety a welcome asylum" in her cloister schools. It is inconceivable

that the students who flocked to Ireland learned there only their religion and the Greek and Latin classics. The very air they breathed was charged with fairy lore and hero tales and poems. They must have carried back to their more prosaic homes in Britain, Gaul and Germany a blessed touch of the kind of poetry indigenous to Irish soil.

Nor were the numerous monasteries of Ireland content with being centres of learning and piety in their mother country. They scattered missionaries to all parts of the then known world, missionaries whose first and last object was the spread of the Gospel, but who used learning, religious and secular, as a powerful means to their end. With the Irish learning and piety ever went hand in hand. It was not long before Continental Europe was dotted with their foundations, the most famous being St. Gall, in Switzerland; Fulda, in Germany, and Bobbio, in Italy. The work of Marianus Scotus will furnish an example of their activity. Born in Ireland in 1028, he traveled to Germany, where he taught mathematics at Ratisbonne, and finally became a monk. He wrote a history of the world from the Creation to the year 1083, following Cassiedorus, Eusebius and Bede, but with the use of such excellent copies of these authors that his work now serves for frequent correction of their text.

Within the last century the value of the learned labors of the Irish on the Continent was brought to light by the researches of the scholarly De Rossi. In their own country the Gaels had ever written and carefully preserved family records and epitaphs. They carried this custom eastward with them. De Rossi, straining after every gleam of light from a distant past, found that vast numbers of early Christian inscriptions and epitaphs had been destroyed, but not before they had been faithfully copied by the monks of Bobbio, by Sedulius Scotus and other Gaels who alone appreciated their value at a time when ignorance had settled over Italy, France and Germany. Fortunately, much of their work escaped destruction, and from it De Rossi was able to gather and to give to the world (in his "Inscriptiones Christianæ") a wealth of information concerning the customs and history of the first Christians.

A curious—and very characteristic—instance of the ancient Gael's influence over the literary destiny of other peoples is related in connection with Taliesin, the most famous of the old Welsh bards, who flourished about the middle of the sixth century, whose poetry was revived in the twelfth and whose name is still revered by his countrymen. His poems celebrate the warlike deeds of Urien, whom tradition makes a nephew of King Arthur's. It seems that

when a youth Taliesin was seized by Irish pirates—for even in that day *all* the Irish did not spend *all* their time in study and deeds of piety. In an improvised boat Taliesin escaped from his captors and made his way to Welsh soil at a spot where one of Urien's sons was fishing. He was taken to Urien's court—and so, with the help of the Gaels, his poetry had found its theme.

In conclusion: While influence is ever an intangible thing, often difficult to trace, it is beyond question, first, that the literature of the Gael exercised unbounded influence at the height of its glory in the sixth and seventh centuries, an influence strongly felt throughout the Middle Ages and not yet dead; and, second, that this influence has ever been potent for good. Its tendency is beautifully typified by the Irish Duns Scotus, who proclaimed, and to a certain degree popularized, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception when St. Bernard and St. Thomas did not admit it and long ages before it was infallibly defined by the Church. Little wonder that to-day loyal and far-sighted Irishmen are striving to revive for their countrymen the language and literature of their glorious past!

F. Gilmore.

Columbus, Ohio.

Book Reviews

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA. In fifteen volumes. Vol. XIII.: Revel—Simon. New York: Robert Appleton Company.

The appearance of Volume XIII. so early in the year is a concrete guarantee that the work will be completed well within the promised time and that what seemed almost an impossible task a few years ago will become an accomplished triumph. Already the additional volume, containing index, corrections and additions, is well under way, and that will crown the work. The editors have asked that their attention be called to mistakes of commission or omission, and they hope to make their work still more perfect by correcting these.

Among the important articles in this volume attention might be called to "Revelation," G. H. Joyce, S. J.; "Rites," a collection of articles covering twenty-two pages; "Roman," a series covering thirty-six pages; "Rome," U. Benigni, fourteen pages; "Sacrifice," J. Pohle, eleven pages; "Schism," twelve pages, and "The Seal of Confession," fifteen pages. Among controversial subjects, "St. Bartholomew's Day," "Savonarola" and "Science and the Church" stand out prominently. Perhaps one should look for the first of this group more naturally under B.

Biography and history are as noticeably strong as usual, and under the latter head we call attention again to the history of dioceses which cannot be gotten anywhere else.

As the book draws to a close attention should be called to the work of Dr. Henry, of St. Charles' Seminary, Overbrook, on the "Hymns of the Breviary." He has been teaching this subject from the beginning in a scholarly manner which is attractive as well as instructive. Looking back one can understand the important part which he is playing in the making of the Encyclopedia, and how well equipped he is in this field, which he has tilled for years with great industry, and which has been to him a labor of love. It becomes more apparent every day that there is only one answer for the person who is seeking correct knowledge about the Catholic Church—get the Catholic Encyclopedia.

THE CULTURE OF THE SOUL. By the *Rev. P. Ryan*, author of "Catholic Doctrines Explained and Proved" and the "Groundwork of Christian Perfection." 12mo., pp. 226. New York Benziger Brothers.

The object the writer has in view in publishing this work is to help persons in the world to acquire Perfection.

The subjects of the present little volume are selected because

of their importance and because of their suitability to persons in every state and condition of life.

While using every effort to make each treatise brief and plain, the author has, at the same time, striven to have his work as complete as possible and to omit nothing which is necessary or useful.

It may strike many that this little book is simplicity itself, and so it is, but the writer has given it years of thought and has so condensed and arranged the matter that while it embraces all that he considers of utility, it is not too diffuse.

From this declaration of the author we learn that it was not his intention to produce a complete work on spirituality, with all the divisions and sub-divisions peculiar to it, but to make a practical guide which could be used by every one seeking that union with God in time and eternity which is the end of the spiritual life. He has succeeded admirably. The book has a simplicity and unction about it that are rare and effective. It draws rather than repels. It makes spiritual subjects pleasant and attractive, and it should do great good.

THE CATHOLIC WHO'S WHO AND YEAR BOOK, 1912. Edited by Sir F. C. Burnand. London: Burns & Oates.

The impartial reviewer may say without fear of being accused of partiality that this is the best book of its kind. In size, in comprehensiveness, in clearness, in conciseness, in style, in type and in paper it is a model. The wonder is that so much can be gotten into such small space without the sacrifice of any of those qualities which we have a right to expect. Generally such books tell us too much or too little. They are made up of tiresome or useless details furnished by interested but uninteresting subjects or of dry facts so tersely put in puzzling abbreviations as to compel the reader to hold a key in his hand all the time. This book tells us about persons worth knowing, the things we want to know, and it makes the knowledge easy of acquirement.

A new feature this year are the illustrations, beginning naturally with His Eminence Cardinal Bourne and including distinguished men and women, lay and ecclesiastical.

HISTOIRE DE L'INQUISITION EN FRANCE. LA PROCEDURE INQUISITORIALE. Par *T. de Cauzons*. 1 vol. in 8. Prix: 7 fr. Bloud et Cie, éditeurs, 7, place Saint-Sulpice, Paris.

M. de Cauzons devoted the first volume of his great "Histoire de l'Inquisition en France" to the "Origins" of this ecclesiastical tribunal. In the present he studies its "Procedure." The same

learning, the same care for impartiality, the same moderation in judgment which made the first volume so successful are to be found in the second.

We trust that M. de Cauzon will soon reach the end of his task, thereby giving us a most complete and precise work on one of the most delicate subjects of controversy.

Although the author disclaims any intention of giving forth his conclusions as final, his work will, we hope, contradict many fables, dissipate many prejudices and, above all, put an end to the gross error which pictures all priests as bloodthirsty and all religious as torturers gloating over the agonies of their victims.

Criminal judges, the Inquisitors felt themselves, as all judges do at times, often torn between the sense of duty to execute the law and their desire to show pity; this latter they did to the utmost possibility.

STUDIES. An Irish Quarterly Review of Letters, Philosophy and Science. Published in March, June, September and December, under the editorial direction of a committee whose chairman is Rev. T. A. Finlay, S. J., Professor of Political Economy in University College, Dublin. For America, 75 cents a number; $3.00 a year. Vol. I., No. 1, 8vo., pp. 220. Dublin: Gill & Son. New York: Benziger Brothers.

We welcome most heartily this new quarterly, which has every prospect of success, because the field is broad, the harvest is abundant and ripe and the reapers are skillful and zealous.

"The hitherto unsettled condition of university education and of higher studies in Ireland have been greatly altered for the better by recent measures. The work of organizing our university system has recently attained definite development." Hence the "Review."

The first number is very interesting and gives fair promise of better things to come. We hope that it will receive a royal welcome.

LA-VIE MEILLEURE PAR LA PRIERE. Par le *P. Badet.* I vol. in 16. Prix: 3 fr. 50. Bloud et Cie, éditeurs, 7, place Saint-Sulpice, Paris (VI.).

Life without prayer will never be happy, because it is a life without God. Where God is lacking, nothing can replace Him. To introduce prayer as an essential element in the human life, ordinarily so dull, so earthly, so painful and often so guilty, is to make life better in every way. Such is the essential idea shining forth in these pages. The numerous hearers of P. Badet will find the echo of his words warmly persuasive.

Family prayer, the child's prayer, that of the rich as of the poor, prayer in all its aspects, is considered in this volume deeply and yet easily to be understood, exact in doctrine and furnishing matter for meditation rich in fruits of edification and good resolutions.